

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LI

MAY, 1953

NO. 1085

Marshal Tito and Cardinal Stepinac

The Editors of the TABLET

*Reprinted from the TABLET**

ON September 24, 1946, six days after the arrest of Archbishop, now Cardinal, Stepinac, the following indictment of him was published:

1. As a member and instigator of the *Ustashi-Krizhari* terrorist group of the defendants Lisak and Shalic and their accomplices, he helped to organize the crimes of the *Ustashi-Krizhari* groups.

2. He collaborated with the occupying Power, and most closely with the so-called Independent State of Croatia of Ante Pavelic, and helped the *Ustashi*.

3. He organized the re-baptism of Serbs in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Catholic Faith.

4. As Military Vicar to the *Ustashi* and other military bands, he was responsible for hundreds of chaplains who incited the *Ustashi* and others to hatred, strife and crimes against the Croat people and other peoples of Yugoslavia, and against their struggle for liberation.

5. He made the Catholic Press, and

above all *Katholiki List*, the semi-official organ of the Archdiocese of Zagreb, a channel of propaganda for the occupying Power, for Pavelic and for the *Ustashi*, for justifying terrorism against the people and forcible conversions to the Catholic Faith, for a filthy campaign against the national liberation struggle, and for the instigation of national and religious hatred.

6. In agreement with Pavelic, he hid the archives of the *Ustashi* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other criminal *Ustashi* documents, in the Archbishop's Palace.

In the present article, we shall consider these points in some detail, confining ourselves in the first part to what is perhaps the most odious of the accusations, made in the third point of the indictment and again in the fifth. It was repeated last week by the *New Statesman and Nation*, which wrote:

* 128 Sloane St., S. W. 1, London, England, January 10 and 17, 1953

Under Pavelic the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Croatia revived the ancient practice of mass conversion by fire and sword; *it seems not to have raised a finger of protest while nearly a quarter of a million Serbs were murdered by the Ustashi.* (Our italics.)

COMPASSION FOR PERSECUTED

If there is one thing which characterized the life of Cardinal Stepinac during the war years, and before the war, it was his boundless compassion for the persecuted, whether Orthodox Serbs, or Jews, or gypsies (who were hunted by the Nazis no less mercilessly than the Jews), or refugees of any kind, and his great efforts to find practical relief for the sufferings of all of them, without regard for race or religion. It shows a great lack of information if it is thought that there were any murders during the war of which he had knowledge against which he "did not raise a finger of protest," and a great credulousness if anyone is even now maintaining that the Catholic Bishops in Croatia were in favor of "mass-conversion by fire and sword."

In 1941, immediately after the collapse of organized Yugoslav resistance to the Germans, the Pavelic Government issued a decree declaring that the Orthodox Church in Croatia was suppressed and that its members must become Latin Catholics. The least instructed of Catholics knows that faith is a supernatural gift of God, and that it is an outrage to suggest that it can be imposed by law or

by force. Without delay, on May 8, 1941, Cardinal Stepinac sent an *ad clerum* to the priests of his diocese, warning them that they must strictly observe the provisions of Canon Law in receiving converts into the Church. On May 14, in a letter to Pavelic, he denounced the execution without trial, at Glina, of 260 Orthodox Serbs. On May 15 he admonished the persecuted Orthodox and Jews that conversions to Catholicism must be sincere. On May 22 he wrote to the Minister of the Interior in the Pavelic Government, denouncing the treatment of Orthodox Serbs, Jews and gypsies. On May 30, having received no reply, he again wrote to the Minister of the Interior in a similar sense. At the end of June Msgr. Ujchic, Archbishop of Belgrade, addressed to Pavelic a letter which Cardinal Stepinac transmitted, appealing for a cessation of the persecution of the Orthodox Serbs in Croatia. In July, preaching in the Cathedral at Zagreb, Cardinal Stepinac said:

We call God to witness that we have always been opposed to any compulsory attachment to the Catholic Church. We must declare that the Church has done all in her power to give aid and protection to the Orthodox.

On July 16, on the instructions of Cardinal Stepinac, Msgr. Loncar, a Canon of Zagreb, who was later executed by the Pavelic Government for his attitude in this matter, called on the Minister for Cults in the Pavelic Government. Throwing on the table

three hundred demands for abjuration of the Orthodox faith, he said:

Whence does the State receive the right to force these people to embrace Catholicism? This is a strictly religious question. The Church cannot, and does not wish to, receive the Orthodox *en masse*, but can only receive individual persons of whom it has been established that they have not been subjected to constraint. . . . The Church cannot and will not receive the ownership of any ecclesiastical or parish building of the Orthodox. . . .

What a policy is now yours, of forcing people to pass from Judaism and Orthodoxy to Catholicism, in order then to assassinate them or intern them in a concentration camp!¹

CONDEMNED CRUELITIES

On November 20, 1941, in a detailed letter to Pavelic, the Cardinal repeated the same arguments, not only reaffirming the position of the Church with regard to conversions, but also vigorously condemning the cruelties that were being perpetrated against the Orthodox. He had established special ecclesiastical commissions to investigate every conversion and to ensure its freedom and sincerity. The Hierarchy met in December, and on December 17 the Cardinal again wrote to Pavelic to

inform him of the position of the Bishops:

The solution of all questions regarding the conversion of dissidents is in the exclusive competence of the Hierarchy. Only those could be received into the Church who, without having been subjected to force of any kind, might be converted of their own free will, after having become convinced in their own mind that the Catholic Church is the only true Church. All illegal procedures against the personal liberty and against the property rights of dissidents should be rigorously prohibited. Dissidents should suffer no punishment, unless it be like that of any other citizens after having had a trial in accordance with all legal requirements.

It had by now become apparent, however, that the Cardinal was faced with a terrible dilemma. The State was massacring wholesale those Orthodox who would not make professions of Catholicism. Either the Cardinal had to relax the canonical rules concerning reception into the Catholic Church, or he had to leave these many victims to their fate. He chose the former course. As he said during his trial:

My conscience does not reproach me. On our side, it was a matter of coming to the succour of the Serbian people.

In February, 1942, he protested to the Minister of the Interior against

¹ Quoted in the *Osservatore Romano*, August 2, 1951.

the demolition of Orthodox churches in the Province of Senj. In his *ad clerum* of March 2, 1942, he left it to his clergy to scrutinize the motives for conversions. Anyone seeking reception into the Church

must embrace the Catholic religion with a pure intention, and not for motives that might not be correct, having faith in the truth of Catholicism. Such must be the first and essential motive in conversion. If there are other secondary motives, if they have not the character of a sin, they will not be an obstacle.

A witness at the Cardinal's trial, Father Crokovic, declared:

I know that replies to the pleas of those who were demanding admission to the Catholic Church were not given on the spot, and I remember that those concerned came weeping to ask that the decision might be hurried, so as to save their lives. If we had not acted as we did, we could be reproached today for having refused to succour that desperate mass of people when we were able to do so.

Atrocious things happened in Bosnia and Herzegovina, when Orthodox Serbs were told to choose between declaring themselves Catholics and being massacred. Cardinal Stepinac condemned these in the long, documented letter which he addressed to Pavelic on November 20, 1941. In the Diocese of Mostar, he wrote,

Men were rounded up like beasts, were assassinated, were thrown, while alive, over precipices. The Sub-Prefect of Mostar, Bajic, a Moslem, openly affirmed that at Ljubljana, during a sin-

gle day, 700 schismatics were thrown into a ravine.

These were responsibilities of the Croat people, but if there was one man who did everything possible to stop them, and, when that proved impossible, to mitigate the sufferings of the victims, it was Cardinal Stepinac. The Cardinal himself founded and financed an orphanage for Serbian children who had lost their parents in the war, and in this he strictly forbade all proselytism.

If the *New Statesman* is ready to show indignation at "forced conversions," we draw its attention to the most numerous "forced conversions" of modern history, which have taken place since the war in the Ukraine, in Rumania and elsewhere in Soviet-dominated territory. These were the subject of the recent Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XII, *Orientales Ecclesias*.² Hundreds of thousands of Catholics of the Eastern rite have been given the choice between apostasy and persecution; all the Bishops of the Catholic Eastern rite in these areas, without exception, have been deported to Siberia or elsewhere for refusing to choose apostasy; many hundreds of priests have suffered death or deportation for the same reason. To draw attention to this is not in any way to extenuate what took place in Croatia, to the great anguish of Cardinal Stepinac; it is only to ask that there shall not be

² See *Catholic Mind*, Vol. LI, No. 1084 (April, 1953), pp. 244-250.

selective indignation in these matters.

It remains to comment on the other charges.

MORE FALSE CHARGES

The first was that Cardinal Stepinac had "helped to organize the crimes of the *Ustashi* - *Krizhari* groups." The *Ustashi* were the armed forces of the puppet State of Croatia proclaimed on April 16, 1941. The *Krizhari*, or cross-bearers, was the name of a Catholic Action youth organization which had existed for some twenty years. As such it was naturally subject to ecclesiastical authority. In the latter stages of the second world war its name was appropriated by an irregular military organization of the *Ustashi*, which in fact had nothing whatever to do with it, and with which Cardinal Stepinac was in no way connected. A priest who was associated with this pseudo-*Krizhari* movement, by name Si-mecki, has described how he was severely reprimanded by the Cardinal for blessing one of its flags. If anyone should find difficulty in believing that the name of a Catholic Action movement could be thus appropriated, let him consider how the very phrase "Catholic Action" is used in Czechoslovakia today. Disreputable organizations have often liked to use Christian camouflage.

According to the second point of the indictment, the Cardinal "collaborated with the occupying Power,

and most closely with the so-called Independent State of Croatia of Ante Pavelic, and helped the *Ustashi*." In May, 1941, immediately after the proclamation of the State of Croatia, Pavelic, its puppet-dictator, led a delegation to Rome to offer the Crown of Croatia to the Duke of Spoleto. It was sought to include Cardinal Stepinac in this delegation. If he had accepted, there would be substantial ground for this part of the indictment brought against him five years later. But in fact he flatly refused. It was the most unequivocal gesture of disassociation.

It is argued by some, supporting the case for the prosecution, that the Cardinal should not have called formally on Pavelic, as he did, or exercised his office in relations with a puppet Government. Two things should be remembered. One is that it is the canonical duty of a Bishop to remain with his people. The second is that, if the Cardinal had made a real break with the regime, and retired, perhaps, to a monastery, he would have been unable to do the immense work which in fact he did for the relief of suffering. The Jews, in particular, must be thankful that Cardinal Stepinac remained in Zagreb throughout the war, and was in a position to make representations to the authorities, as he constantly did.

It was, for instance, directly due to him that the infamous Nuremberg Laws, against the Jews, were with-

drawn in Croatia within a few days of their promulgation. Communists also have reason to be thankful — for example, the brothers Vlado and Vada Kures, who were sentenced to death for Communism in November, 1942, and for whom the Cardinal obtained a reprieve. In May, 1943, when the Cardinal made his *ad limina* visit to Rome, the Pavelic Government made representations to the Holy See, asking that he should be told "to desist from his severe attitude towards us." In December of that year the Croat Minister of the Interior complained to the Rt. Rev. Ramiro Marcone, O. S. B., Apostolic Visitor to Croatia, that Cardinal Stepinac "has never uttered a single word to show his adherence to the present Government."

ABUNDANT REFUTATION

The charge of "collaboration" with the Germans and with the Pavelic regime has been answered by such an abundant documentation that we may be excused from recapitulating the detail here. During the war, indeed, the clandestine radio of Marshal Tito's own partisans acclaimed Cardinal Stepinac for his uncompromising opposition to the Nazis and their protégés. It quoted, for instance, the sermon which he delivered on the feast of Christ the King, 1943, to which reference is made below. This praise from the partisans was monitored at the time by the BBC,

and the record of it remains in the war-time files of the monitoring service.

During the war the daily bulletin of extracts from the Press of enemy-occupied territories made by the British Ministry of Information contained frequent testimony to the strong attitude maintained by the Cardinal. Indeed, if there was one Catholic prelate in the whole of Europe who provided material that was useful to the Allied propaganda services, it was Cardinal Stepinac. His own brother was executed by the Germans on November 23 for having assisted the partisans, and the Cardinal himself was something of a national hero when the war came to an end. He was fêted by the Communist regime in September, 1945. The sudden reversal of view which made him an enemy of the State instead of a national hero was a *volte-face* of the kind which has been so familiar among Communists for so long that it is strange that this particular example was not generally recognized long ago.

It may also be pointed out that the indictment of the Cardinal did not mention the word "treason," although that word is not infrequently used by others who condemn him, as, for example, a writer in last week's issue of *Time and Tide*. If he committed treason, it could only have been treason to the Royal Yugoslav Government of King Peter, since in

the spring of 1941 Marshal Tito's "National Liberation Movement" had not yet come into existence. And those who are so ready to find that the Cardinal was guilty of treason should remember that the same charge could much more easily be made, if the war years are being discussed, against Marshal Tito himself. Rejection of the pre-war regime is an essential condition of citizenship in Yugoslavia today, and the Government of Marshal Tito could hardly attack the Cardinal on the ground that he fulfilled that condition.

The fourth point of the indictment said:

As Military Vicar to the *Ustashi* and other military bands, he was responsible for hundreds of chaplains who incited the *Ustashi* and others to hatred, strife and crimes against the Croat people and other peoples of Yugoslavia, and against their struggle for liberation.

In October, 1940, before Yugoslavia had been invaded, the Holy See, at the request of the Bishops of Yugoslavia, gave Cardinal Stepinac the faculty of exercising the functions of a Military Vicar in case of war, without formally bearing that title. He was, therefore, Ordinary to the regular Army of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. He was *not* appointed in this capacity to "the *Ustashi* and other military bands." But, even if he had been, it is a curious point of view which regards it as disgraceful to minister to soldiers who fight in a bad cause. Few, we think, would

maintain that soldiers should be denied the consolations of religion unless their wars are approved of; the same logic would require a denunciation of priests who serve as prison chaplains, on the ground that they minister to criminals.

The fifth charge read:

He made the Catholic Press, and above all *Katholiki List*, the semi-official organ of the Archdiocese of Zagreb, a channel of propaganda for the occupying Power, for Pavelic and the *Ustashi*, for justifying terrorism against the people and forcible conversions to the Catholic Faith, for a filthy campaign against the National Liberation struggle, and for the instigation of national and religious hatred.

The denunciation of the Catholic Press omits to mention that the leading Catholic daily, *Hrvatski Glas*, was suppressed within a few days of the establishment of the Pavelic regime, and that within two months the number of Catholic periodicals had already been reduced by one-third. *Katholiki List* is referred to only as the "semi-official" organ of the Archdiocese; and it is even less reasonable to make the Cardinal personally responsible for everything that appeared in its pages when it is remembered that he himself was attacked by his own "semi-official" organ.

A notable example occurred in the autumn of 1943. On the feast of Christ the King in that year, preaching in his cathedral, Cardinal Stepinac denounced the German practice of imposing collective punishment on

whole districts where acts of sabotage had been committed by the resistance movement. Copies of this sermon were printed and widely distributed, and in Dalmatia alone eight-two priests were arrested and imprisoned as a result. On November 3, therefore, the Cardinal was rebuked by the *Völkischer Beobachter*, and also by the Croat Government daily, *Hrvatski Narod*, in which the Croat Minister for Enlightenment denounced him for "meddling in politics." The rest of the Croat Press then took up the attack, and *Katholiki List* was among those papers which denounced the very Cardinal who was afterwards said to be responsible for all it had printed in these years.

Finally, the indictment says that, "in agreement with Pavelic," the Cardinal "hid the archives of the *Ustashi* Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other criminal *Ustashi* documents, in the Archbishop's Palace." It is true that at the end of the war, when the Pavelic Government was in flight, it asked to be allowed to deposit its archives in the Archbishop's Palace. It is also true that the Cardinal said that he would hand them over to the new authorities. This he did, obtaining from the new authorities of Marshal Tito a receipt for them.

Such was the indictment on which the Cardinal was sentenced, on October 11, 1946, to sixteen years in prison.



Red Heretics

The purge-ridden Communists have now figured out thirty-five different ways to denounce someone.

Goaded by Moscow's desire for violent purge, the Communist word-coiners are filling their controlled press with brand new words designed to catch anyone, however innocent, and indict him for "thought crime."

The U. S. High Commission in Berlin, scanning the Eastern press for clues to the reasons behind the purge, compiled today a survey that listed the kind of "isms" that mean heresy to the Kremlin:

Trotskyism, Zionism, cosmopolitanism, objectivism, particularism, burocratism, unionism, diversionism, schematism, imperialism, Titoism, pacificism, conciliationism, individualism, factionalism, practicisim, neutralism, relativism, critical realism, militarism, chauvinism, Social Democratism, opportunism, careerism, equalitarianism, theoreticism, formalism, naturalism, collaborationism, opposition to internal party democracy, bourgeois attitude, kulak attitude, lack of vigilance, lack of class consciousness and uncritical attitude.—*The Associated Press*, Jan. 24, 1953.

"But They are not Dogmas!"

THE REV. JOSEPH F. DONNELLY

Reprinted from SOCIAL ACTION BULLETIN*

MOST of us have heard the oft-told story of the old gentleman who fidgeted uneasily in his pew as *Rerum Novarum* was read from the pulpit of St. Patrick's Cathedral back in 1891. As the reading progressed he became more and more uneasy until finally he stormed out of the church muttering audibly as he went: "Socialism! Socialism!"

But that was in 1891 and since then Catholics have come a long way! Possibly. But a couple of years ago as we listened to one of the local pastors give his people a mild serving of Catholic social teaching we saw a man get up in his pew in the middle aisle and march. And the usher told us later that as he passed he informed him that he came to church "to hear about religion, not politics and Socialism."

In 1931 in *Quadragesimo Anno* Pius XI had to rebuke Catholics who had protested the teachings of Leo XIII "as if they smacked of a socialistic or revolutionary spirit." And then a few years later in *Divini Redemptoris*, after Q. A. had had such rough going in some Catholic circles, he had to criticize

... the action of those Catholic employers who in one place succeeded in preventing the reading of our encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* in their local Churches ... and ... those Catholic industrialists who even to this day have shown themselves hostile to a labor movement that We Ourselves recommended.

This unwillingness to go along, this jarring of the conservative, and often too comfortable, Catholics has long been a problem in the Church. The Catholic social reformers of the 19th century, who so accurately read the signs and sounded the warnings, were considered by many to be infected with Socialism. And these "many" were often very good people, personally holy and munificent in their charities. They sincerely dreaded unions as hot-beds of revolution, and they considered social legislation as "Statism" and destructive of private enterprise and initiative.

But that was in the 19th century. That was before we had clear, bold and solemn pronouncements on these matters by the Supreme Pontiffs. That was before the official Church stepped up to the problems of today and ap-

*Highland Hgts., Box 1224, New Haven 5, Conn., Dec. 15, 1952

plied the moral principles. Certainly there are technical areas of social problems that are in the realm of debate and opinion. But the fundamental social principles, the basic attitudes on social problems, *these have been put beyond debate by the Church and fall under the obligation of good morals.*

Accordingly, although there was a time when a position on social questions which was in conflict with good morals could be reasonably explained, if not defended, such an explanation seems incongruous today. The Church has spoken. In fact this was the distinct service of *Rerum Novarum*. It cleared the air for Catholics. It stated the official doctrine. That is why Pius XII speaks of its publication as an event "worthy of being written in letters of gold in the calendar of the Church."

OBLIGE IN CONSCIENCE

"*But they are not dogmas!*" No theologian would hold that only solemnly defined doctrines place an obligation on the Catholic conscience. To the contrary all theologians agree that the Church has been commissioned by God to teach with authority on matters of faith and morals, and that the encyclicals of the Church are solemn doctrinal pronouncements which oblige in conscience.

Most American Catholics no doubt regard our economy as sound and prosperous, and people who are pros-

pering under our economic system cannot easily be persuaded to study its defects in the light of Catholic social teaching.

Yet the majority of American families have annual incomes inadequate for decent Christian living. An ever growing portion of our families live in congested, urban areas where housing is often substandard or too confined for child-rearing or too expensive for low incomes. To supplement insufficient family incomes millions of mothers must seek work outside the home. All phases of our economy are affected with "bigness" in which the individual and his family have come to play a less and less secure role.

All these are serious social problems which make extremely difficult for millions the living of a life in accord with Christ's moral teachings. These are not problems which are far-removed or technical. They are as immediate as the penitent stripping his soul of the sins which have been occasioned by these problems. It seems that so often our concern goes only to the diseased fruit we find on the tree; we neglect to dig down and uncover and cure the diseased roots. But surely far more fundamental than broken homes and juvenile delinquency, divorce and birth control are the problems of security in a job, family living wages, adequate housing, unions, racial justice and industry councils and the rest.

But we have so many Catholics who

are so smug and indifferent to these problems. Many are so muddled in their thinking that they are constantly excommunicating those who do show a little concern. We have no doubt that if one were to take any discourse of Pius XII on current social problems and select ten statements without identifying them, the majority of the statements would be rejected by the majority at any ordinary Catholic gathering. Quotes taken directly from the social encyclicals are even at this late date "socialistic" to many Catholics. How often this handy label is ready for pasting on any social program which runs counter to the particular interests of some! Catholics have a reputation for conservatism which most of us would like to think is undeserved.

In *Quadragesimo Anno* the Holy Father deplores the number of those

"who, professing to be Catholics, are almost completely unmindful of the sublime law of justice and charity. . . ." Thus the encyclical is addressed to the "professing" Catholic, the "practical" Catholic, the "good" Catholic. The obligations there outlined place on him not only a personal obligation, but a social obligation. He is to spread the Church's social teaching among his fellows.

The priest cannot do the job. He can but ignite the spark which will enkindle the interest of the laity. But it is they—in labor unions, in management, in the professions, in social work, in the schools—it is they who must learn that they are in the front lines of the Church's life, not as warriors, but as witnesses to the truth which is their heritage and the justice which should live among all men. That is the teaching of the Popes.



Separation of the Moral and Legal Orders

These last decades, the walls of civilization's courts have been defaced, not only by the sprawling, defiant handwriting of the lawless, but by the polished, incisive phrases of those philosophers who have cut deeply into the fabric of men's belief in natural moral law. "Right," they tell us, is only an "empty substratum" to account for legal coercion. "Force, mitigated by good manners," is the ultimate explanation of legality. "Natural law and an ultimate standard of justice," they repeat, "are examples of illusion on illusion."

Washington warned us long since against those who would drive a wedge between religion and morality. This century's attack on the natural moral law has driven a wedge between the moral and the legal order. Its effects are all too sadly clear.—*The Rev. Laurence J. McGinley, S. J., at the annual Red Mass, St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, N. Y., Nov. 2, 1952.*

Magnitude of the Communist Challenge

CHARLES MALIK

Delegate from Lebanon to the United Nations

*This address, delivered at Fordham University, October 29, 1952,
is reprinted from THOUGHT.**

I UNDERSTAND the supreme external issue of the moment to be the Communist challenge. Every other problem is subordinate to this, and any strategy, whether with respect to Europe or the Middle East or Asia, whether it deals with military or economic or cultural matters, any strategy that is not ordered to the ultimate resolution of this issue, on every level on which it strikes, is not only inadequate, but actually plays into the hands of Communism itself. There is little freedom of action left until the challenge of Communism is faced and resolved.

Because of limitations of time I have to be concise, and therefore I must leave it to your creative imagination to supply the links of reasoning behind much of what I shall say. I shall marshal phenomena, the quiet, total contemplation of which will alone disclose the magnitude of the challenge. The situation is exceedingly complex, revealing a sort of day of judgment in which everything is crucially in the balance. He will not find his bearings in the world today

who does not seriously and always grapple with this challenge.

Let me first dwell on the Asiatic situation in general. Neither poverty, nor starvation, nor social and economic injustice have by themselves caused the spread of Communism through Asia. Nor will the removal of these scourges tomorrow do away with the threat of Communism. All these are privative things, whereas Communism appeals and spreads by the action of an active agency.

Nothing is clearer in the writings of the masters of Communism than that they profoundly distrusted the efficacy of the proletariat to give rise by itself to any great movement. They viewed the proletariat as a mere given passive base to be built upon, organized, used, for the purposes of the revolution. In the *Manifesto* "the Communists" are conceived as "the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties . . . which pushes forward all others." Again and again Lenin and Stalin develop the concept of the *Communist Party* as the "vanguard," "the organized

*Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y., Winter, 1952-53

detachment," "the highest form of class organization" of the proletariat, and, therefore, "as the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat." "The Party cannot be a real party," writes Stalin, "if it limits itself to registering what the masses of the working class feel and think, if it follows in the tail of the spontaneous movement, if it is unable to overcome the inertness and the political indifference of the spontaneous movement. . . ." (Stalin: *Foundations of Leninism*, International Publishers, New York, 1939, pp. 108-109.)

A WORLD MOVEMENT

The chief *active* cause of Communism, then, is the fact that Communism is a fully articulated, centrally directed, world movement, with consecrated agents preaching its doctrine and way of life with extraordinary zeal, and organizing Communist cells everywhere. The Communist agent, fully indoctrinated and in constant touch with the masters of Communism, is behind every Communist movement anywhere in Asia.

One wishes the Western tourists who have written books on their "impressions of Asia" had seen the concrete agency of these agents, had in fact sought them out and "studied" them. Had they been willing or able to do so, they would have been profoundly disturbed, infinitely more so than by the "sordid conditions" which seem to have so sentimentally

"impressed" them; they would have seen a zeal, a fanaticism, a sense of mission, a dialectical power, a sure sensing of the pulse of the masses, and, above all, an asceticism, which would have devastatingly contrasted with anything to which they were used. One thing the Western world must learn: that without profound conviction concerning the nature of things it can never beat Communism.

A striking illustration of the necessity for an "active cause" above and beyond misery and hunger and dispossession is the recent history of China. However one argues this history, the fact remains that in an actual civil war in which one side was supported by international Communism and the other by the West, Communism succeeded in expelling the West and establishing itself on the continent. Communism won in China at the edge of the sword, and nothing more has arrested it on its march than that it has not so far won in Korea.

Western Europe has had intimate contacts with Asia for generations. The intellectual classes of Asia all know European languages and are fairly conversant with Western modes of thinking. Now in Western Europe there are vigorous Communist parties. What is there to prevent international Communism from infiltrating into Asia by way of these parties? In the Near East, for instance, Communist ideas have reached us not

directly from Russia, but indirectly from France, England or Germany. There is no escape from the tragic consequences of the inner self-division of the West. Asia and Africa are rebelling against the West, not only by reason of the classical Western ideas of freedom and independence, but also because Communism has softened the West to the extent that Western elements are themselves inciting these two continents against the West. The role of the Italian, French, German and other European Communist parties in the active furthering of Communist thought and revolution throughout the world is a fascinating story still to be written.

The immense land mass and the teeming populations of Asia themselves present a disadvantage to the West in its contest with Communism. Once Communism receives a lodgment in Asia, it will be very difficult to dislodge it. The West cannot oppose massiveness by massiveness, but by the development of qualitative excellence on every level.

There is efficacy in sheer existence and in continued existence. Communism, in its politico-historical existence, has now endured for a generation. Despite opposition, it has moved from victory to victory. Thus there is not only the lure of being; there is the emphatic beckoning of the bandwagon. People are impressed by the power of Communism to exist and to triumph.

The miraculous shrinking of the world whereby ideas, objects and men are conveyed from one place to another with increasing rapidity (a development for which you in this country have been as responsible as any other people) has been an active agency in the spread of Communism. Everybody today knows what others have and have not, and it is impossible any longer to conceal the appalling inequalities, material and cultural, throughout the world. It is the agency of this knowledge, and not the inequalities in themselves, that has actualized a sense of injustice issuing in general rebellion. When I suddenly realize my nakedness, and when at that very moment somebody comes along with a plausible interpretation, directing my rebellion and sense of shame, and enabling me to cover myself up with some rags, then certainly I will go along, especially if nobody else then comes forward with a better and deeper interpretation.

FURTHERING COMMUNISM

The coincidence of three facts: a) the sudden spread of enlightenment throughout the world; b) the readiness of the Communists to fill this enlightenment with a message; and c) the absence of a corresponding effective message emanating either from the West or from native resources—this coincidence has been potent in furthering Communism throughout the world.

It is not a question of "the Slavic spirit" or of "the Russian soul" at all: it is a question of Marx and Marxism. The ability to see the truth of this distinction is part of the great challenge. The rest of the world therefore is contending in reality not with the Russians, but with Marx and his doctrine, and with the Russians to the extent that they have allowed themselves to be dominated by Marx. There undoubtedly is moral responsibility here, but the Russians must also be viewed as infinitely deeper than Marx, and therefore as fully capable of expunging him from their system. Their boundless energy, their exuberant imagination, their ability to suffer, their childlike character, their communal sense, their deep patriotism and love of "Mother Russia," their contagious conviviality, their profound asceticism, the mystical streak in their nature, their genuine love for humanity everywhere (cf. Dostoyevsky), their rebellion therefore against discrimination, their pregnant predisposition to eschatology, the persistence among them of deep religious faith despite all persecution—these are characters for which on the whole the Russians should be loved.

The sum total of all this is the Russian word that is not yet uttered, and the Western world, out of respect for the truth and also out of a desire to promote peace and understanding, must make the Russians feel that it

respects them too much to believe that Marxist Communism is really what they want to say. Russian technology, industry, science, literature and spirituality will remain, a blessing to Russia and to the rest of the world, long after Communism has been overcome and completely forgotten. The understanding and acceptance of the positive ground of goodness and truth in the Russian soul as distinct from the distortions and perversions of Communism is an inescapable challenge to the Western world. Whoever confuses the Russians purely and simply with Communism is not only not in the truth: he positively plays into the hands of Communism itself.

NATIONALISM

Western civilization is further challenged by nationalism in Asia and Africa. This is a whole inquiry by itself. The rise and development of this nationalism cannot be understood apart from the following themes: 1) the rivalry of the Western powers, itself a manifestation of European nationalism; 2) the weakening of Europe as a result of its internecine wars; 3) the overshadowing of Europe by its two gigantic offshoots, America and Russia; 4) the fact that these two offshoots had different ideas about Asia and its relations to the West from those entertained by Europe; 5) the Communist fanning of anti-Western nationalism; 6) the impact of the European ideas of "the

nation," "the state," "democracy," "self-rule," and "representative government" upon the dependent peoples; 7) the rise of Western-trained national leaders who for various reasons and in diverse ways were absolutely sold on the liberation of their countries; 8) the slow inner maturation of the dependent peoples themselves; 9) the excesses and exploitations which foreign rule in many instances practised; and 10) the great example and influence of Japan.

Asian nationalism need not by itself be anti-Western. Its aim is not only self-rule, but the revival and affirmation of native values: the deities of the tribe. What is happening therefore is the pluralization of the world: every people, every culture is asserting itself *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world. Every believer in being and individuality must bless this assertion, for there is such a moral solidarity among men that where people are not free and are not fully themselves we are all the losers. The danger arises not from the assertion in itself, but from the absence of an over-arching universal order, both political and intellectual, within which the assertion may find its place.

For the absence of such an order the West has only itself to blame. The universal was discovered, elaborated and worshipped in the West; and yet in recent centuries it was put aside in favor of external political and economic arrangements. Is it conceivable

that if the West during the last two centuries had not been preoccupied with lesser things, but had unashamedly put forward, in a spirit of unity and charity, its deepest and holiest values, the East would not have found a genuine, positive, universal idea within which it could assert itself?

THE WEST IS CHALLENGED

People crave for nothing more than for the universal, and when the genuine universal is held back from them, they will espouse any counterfeit brand that comes their way. The greatest danger is not in nationalism, but in the possibility that Asian nationalism will find available only the Communist universal to attach itself to. The West is challenged to produce a valid, adequate, fundamental community of ideas within which the East can accommodate itself: in peace, in justice and with a sense of complete fulfillment.

There is room for a grounded investigation into the effect of the economic and political example of America upon the rest of the world. Rightly or wrongly, America to many minds means money, luxury and material things. The materialists everywhere entertain a secret envy and admiration of the American success. The deeper social and spiritual virtues of American life are little known abroad, except as an American missionary—and American missionaries are among the salt of the earth—con-

cretely exemplifies them in his life. When therefore dialectical materialism stresses material and economic determination, it receives potent indirect support from the prevalent American meaning.

The American philosophy of independence has exerted a powerful influence upon Asia and Africa. From the point of view of the Communist challenge, one must ask whether independence today can mean only what it meant in the eighteenth century—namely, a political act within the same cultural whole. International Communism also preaches independence and promotes the so-called “national liberation movements,” when nothing is more certain than that both theoretically and in practice independence is abhorrent to the Communist creed. In the crucial interplay of concrete forces today, abstract individualistic concepts do not apply, and while the Western community as a whole, with all its tested values, is under ruthless attack, the highest quality of statesmanship is required to make sure that independence does not mean the actual or potential transfer of allegiance to the Communist camp.

The importance of cultural and racial continuities between the Soviet realm and the territories contiguous to it has not been sufficiently discussed. This fact alone, entirely apart from any Communist ideology, places the Western world at a tremendous

disadvantage. The sprawling existence of the Communist empire at the heart of the Eurasian continent is in the end perhaps the most decisive geopolitical fact.

CULTURAL TIES

There is not a people in Asia that does not have cultural and racial cousins, if not brothers, in the Soviet orbit. Identity of race, culture, language and religion exerts a powerful osmotic pull upon the peoples across the Soviet frontiers. There is a far greater existential chasm between the West and Asia than between the Soviet Union and Asia; a chasm that cannot be bridged by artificial or clever means. If the West has to worry about how to make the notions of freedom, responsibility, reason and individuality plausible to the peoples of Asia, Communism is plagued by no such worry at all. The massiveness and group consciousness to which the peoples of Asia are used are precisely the terms with which Communism addresses them.

Nothing therefore is more important than to develop continuities and links with Asia, than to expand all existing natural and cultural ties. In a sense, this problem measures the degree of unity or disunity in the Western world. For if this world, in face of the great crisis of the moment, really felt as one, it would rejoice that parts of it already have important ties with the realms beyond.

There are continuities, for instance, between Germany and Eastern Europe, or among the peoples and cultures of the Mediterranean basin, that the Western world cannot afford not to promote if it not going to doom itself. And within Asia itself there are natural continuities whose development serves the cause of peace. Is there any doubt that the Arabs have natural ties with large parts of Africa and Asia, that the Indians and Pakistanis have special intermediating responsibilities for the whole continent, and that a healthy Japan can perform an invaluable service for peace through her many natural links and continuities in the Far East?

Unless that which exists by nature is fully understood, respected and promoted, there will arise gaps, breaks, unnatural tensions in the texture of peace. To jump, for instance, all the way from Detroit to Teheran without taking into account the intermediate lands and mentalities is to place unnecessary strains upon one's powers. Each part of the Western world has absolutized itself with respect to the other parts; each part has endeavored to relate itself directly and exclusively to the rest of the world. But this is not the way of community, especially in a moment of crisis: this is the way of weakness and doom. The need is to recapture wholeness, and in dealing with the world to re-establish depth, structure, articulation, graduation, continuity,

nuance, "the middle term." Some of the most pregnant relations are indirect.

In this connection, the American citizens who trace their descent to Africa, the Far East, the Near East, or Eastern Europe, constitute possibilities of structure and mediation that may not be disregarded. I am fully aware that this involves political, psychological, cultural and existential difficulties; but if America is to establish real direct continuities with the non-European worlds comparable to what the Soviet Union has achieved, it would seem that all possibilities must be explored.

WESTERN AGENCIES

Western non-governmental agencies (missions, free business enterprises, schools, hospitals, foundations) have been operating in Asia and Africa for centuries. In most instances they developed great legacies of good will for the West. Where Communism struck or where radical nationalism prevailed, these voluntary forces of understanding were swept away. The challenge is to deepen their activity wherever they still can hold on: proceeding as never before from a basis of absolute faith and conviction, and entering into bolder ventures of partnership with the peoples whom they intend to serve.

The Western world has genuine friends in Asia and Africa who drank deep from the great positive tradition.

They have known Western spirituality at its highest. They hate darkness and tyranny, and rejoice in truth, mind, reason, light, the infinite joy of the spirit. If the best and truest in the West should go down, they would rather go down with it. But they do become sad, deeply sad at times. And why? Because of Western division and uncertainty; because the West in its dealings does not always live up to its best lights; because Western secularism and self-sufficiency is a great scandal before the world; because there is a predominant reliance upon material things; because there are depths of truth and love and being in the West of which the world is not worthy, but which the West, in its dealings with the outside world, either forgets or is ashamed of or hides under a bushel.

Now these friends belong to the continuities that should be strengthened. They will be terribly maligned by the Communists in a thousand subtle and crude ways. Other dark forces, hating the West and everything it stands for, will also wish to overwhelm them. Thus their utmost mettle will be tried. On the other hand, the West may be tempted to appease at their expense; they may appear too embarrassing. But a civilization that is frightened to the extent of disclaiming parts of itself abroad has already sealed its own doom. For life and being belong to the universal, and it belongs neither to *realpolitik*

nor to high statesmanship to make withdrawals in the order of the spirit. The challenge is how to love and believe in the truth so as to detect and defend it wherever it exists; how not to be ashamed of one's own truth lived and loved abroad.

If the Western world is going to allow the strains and stresses that have recently overtaken it to develop further, it will not be able to stand up to the challenge of Communism. The moment is such that the West can ill afford the luxury of inner division, no matter how grievous the provocation.

SHOULD RESOLVE DIFFERENCES

The political differences among the great Western allies, both as regards the organization of Europe and the determination of the relationships of Europe to the non-European world, are serious. Whoever rejoices in these differences and helps aggravate them is certainly the enemy of the West. Is it impossible to conceive of a Western conference on the highest possible level with the aim of resolving these differences on the basis of truth and justice, and with the spirit of charity?

Nothing is impossible when responsible Western leaders fully realize that the holiest values of their common civilization are today in deadly peril. The one hope of Western civilization is that the political and moral solidarity of the Atlantic community be further developed and strength-

ened. Unless this happens, Marx and his apostles will be right—namely, that the West is doomed to fall apart because it is all a squabble for power and all a matter of “higher profits!” But everything depends on the deliberate invalidation by the West of the theories of Karl Marx—that is, on the concrete demonstration that we are not just creatures of desire and of lust for power, but that higher principles enter into our determination, both individually and in the aggregate: principles of reason, of mutual forbearance, of voluntary renunciation, of devotion to truth, of worship of what is holy and transcendent, and of belief in the Living God.

Everything depends on the concrete demonstration that the Western world contains an active principle which, by touching and transforming the hearts of men, not only invalidates any sub-human determinism, but establishes a free and creative determinism of its own.

TRADE BARRIERS

The economic difficulties of the Western community must be honestly faced. Economic aid by this country is only a temporary expedient; it cannot be the permanent solution. The more than 200 million industrialized people of Western Europe can only live and prosper if trade barriers among them are removed, if the United States and Canada lower their tariffs against the products of their

skills, and if they apply their techniques to great schemes of development wherever they can.

Which is more important—that only one part of the Western community should prosper even if that should endanger the whole, or that the whole should more or less uniformly prosper and therefore stand firm against the adversary, even if that should mean a relative curbing of desire on the part of some? Here again is a test of how much the West constitutes a real organic community in face of the common present danger, and therefore of whether it can develop the conscious human will to invalidate the forebodings of the Marxists.

It is the spiritual crisis that is far more disturbing than either the political stresses or the economic strains. In fact these would never have arisen if the spirit were not in trouble. The rebellious type, the type that knows no respect for anything above itself, the type that delights in destruction and apparently cannot “give God the praise,” this type is rampant today. There is a prevailing materialism which is not much superior to the dialectical kind. There is further a disturbance of right order. The mind inclines toward the lower, the elemental, the multiform, the dark, the primitive, in place of facing light, truth, being. The only saving grace of this Western materialism is that so far it has not extinguished the great

organs of the mind and spirit which still operate in perfect freedom. It is from these agencies that salvation is going to come. What is needed is a great wave of respect and obedience, a fundamental ordering of the welter of desire.

GOD OR SECULARISM

If there is a God and if He has spoken, then history cannot go on without Him and His Word. To be sure, we humans cannot look at God with a steady gaze: He is so overpowering that we are all immediately tempted to seek elsewhere for relief. This is indeed our greatest failing: *to try to let go of Him*. But it is hopeless for the West which has known the Living God to forget Him. He simply will not let it forget. And thus the ultimate challenge is whether the West is going to center its life in God or in something else, such as "progress" or "adjustment" or "science" or "social justice" or "higher and higher standards of living." Secularism or God—this seems to be the challenge. The rebellion and fanaticism of Communism can only be met by a power and conviction that, for the West, only its real God, reaffirmed on a broad national basis, can provide.

I believe that Western Christianity, whether Protestant or Catholic, must pray with greater purity of heart for the Eastern Orthodox Church, this Church which, in God's inscrutable economy, was chosen to bear

throughout the centuries the brunt of the attack far more than its Western sisters. This is integral to the magnitude of the challenge. There have been lately heartening signs that the ancient Church of the East is not altogether forgotten in the West.

More and more men of vision are seeing what it is all about, are compassing the challenge in all its dimensions. May their number increase, and may there arise leaders who fear only God and the truth, to the end that they speak to the world in ringing words of authority. Above all childishness and superficiality, above all softness and self-seeking, grounded in history, disciplined in manner and mind, these leaders should ascetically overcome the essential sensuousness of the age. The greatest challenge is whether the secular and intellectual leadership of the West is adequate to the demands of the moment.

For centuries the Western world has been faced with two ultimate issues: how to accommodate the principle of freedom, and how to relate itself to the outside world.

It is evident you cannot be free in your economic activity or in your political action or *vis-à-vis* the compulsions of nature unless you were originally free to think and judge for yourself. Thus the question of freedom in the last analysis is the question of the place of reason *vis-à-vis* both what is above and what is below reason. The first instance of

the question of freedom, then, is the question of freedom of thought, not in the degraded sense of man's "right" to rebel against and diverge from the truth, and thus to float pleasantly in a subjective region of so-called "free thought," but precisely in the positive sense of reason's natural ability to know the objective and independent truth. In other words, the question of freedom, in any of its aspects, is absolutely inseparable from the question of the reality and nature of reason, and this in turn is absolutely inseparable from the question of objective and independent truth.

TRUTH AND REASON

Is there an objective order of truth, can we grasp it, how may we grasp it, what is its precise, concrete character—this fundamental question is behind every issue of freedom, whether freedom of economic enterprise or freedom in the great institutions of politics, or personal freedom. I crave for freedom not just to remain eternally "free" and undecided; I crave for freedom in order to avoid error and find and dwell in the truth. It can thus be shown that if the Western world does not quite make out the place of freedom, or, in less exact language, if there is in the Western world a profound confusion concerning freedom, it is because there is a more original confusion concerning truth and reason. The wonderful pas-

sion in the so-called "free world" for freedom is in the end a more or less confused passion for the certainty of truth and reason. For he alone is free who trusts the disciplined and illumined reason to reveal to him whatever truth it can, including above all the truth of the nature and limitations of reason itself.

The philosophical challenge is whether subjectivism and idealism and pragmatism and positivism and voluntarism are going to remain the dominant themes in Western thought, or whether there is going to be an effective and chastened return to the great realistic tradition. Enough of departure and rebellion—it is time, I think, to reappropriate, in childlike humility, the wonderful truths of the positive tradition. In this tradition alone, reason brings us with a sure touch nearest to the truth. There is an anarchic principle of freedom and there is a contemplative one; the soul knows peace only when the urge of anarchy yields to the freedom of contemplation and knowledge.

The magnitude of the challenge will reveal itself only as we meditate upon and turn over these phenomena for a long time. When we concretely take in the concrete significance of these things; contemplating the *Communist Party* as the active agency radically hating all the ultimate values of Western civilization and virulently assailing them everywhere; remembering the agency of this Party in

China and through its Western branches in the rest of the East; noting the Communist infiltration and softening of the Western body politic and social itself; realizing the difficulty in a world in crisis of distinguishing properly between Communism and the Russian people; considering the cultural, racial and geopolitical continuities and discontinuities throughout the world; keeping in mind that awakened peoples will not allow themselves to starve spiritually, but must seek doctrine, conviction, a way of life; understanding the full import of the nationalist movement and of the economic and political meaning of America; meditating upon the political, economic and spiritual strains in the Western world, and upon the crisis of freedom and reason—when we dwell upon all these issues and take in their concrete significance, then, and then for the first time, the full amplitude of the challenge emerges.

One is then tempted to see in the present situation the hand of necessity, a sort of inexorable *moira* (fate). It is as though the whole universe has been conspiring to the present judgment.

DANGEROUS COMPLACENCY

It is an elementary rule of probability that success in the past, no matter how frequent, does not necessarily entail success in the future. For the future is always and ever open. The

fact that Western civilization has survived 3,000 years of assault is no guarantee that, in the present instance, it will also survive. Faith indeed is wonderful, but nothing is more foolish, nothing more sentimental, nothing indeed more faithless, than the thoughtless complacency whereby people, with stupid lightness of heart and without fear of God, still believe that *somehow* all will be well in the end. I believe the primary requisite for a sober facing of the present challenge is a profound anxiety that precisely in this instance all may not turn out well in the end.

The way out is to meet active agency by active agency, force by force, organization by organization, and, above all, doctrine by doctrine. Force without doctrine is blind, and people will not respect it. Doctrine without force is powerless, especially when the dark and elemental is rising to smash every source of light. And without an active, organized agency, even the best intention and the mightiest force cannot enter constructively into the fabric of history.

What then are the grounds of my hope? I do not believe that the civilization which discovered the universal and gloried in the mind and its ability to know the real truth by reason and argument; the civilization which bent everything to the unfolding of man's responsible freedom, to the end that he may know the joy of friendship; the civilization which required

that the truth, to be the truth, must incarnate itself in flesh and blood; the civilization which cannot be understood without the lure of real, existing, transcendent norms, full of meaning and life; the civilization in whose midst the suffering love of God

forgave us all, and granted to the pure of heart power from on high to overcome darkness and death; the civilization which tasted the peace of being—I do not believe that a civilization so burdened and so blessed has come to an end.



Some Facts to be Faced

A third of the world's population has now come under the domination of the most ruthless, aggressive and absolute dictatorship history has ever seen—that of the Communist "Living Buddha," Stalin. In the circumstances, we have to ask ourselves whether the rest of the people of this planet—increasing by something more than 60,000 each day—are also destined to swell the ranks of the Red slaves, or whether the Kingdom of Christ is to grow strong again, and build up a "new order" of human freedom and sanity.

Are we as individuals, and as a community, making a real effort in the war of wills and ideas which is in progress, not merely in Korea or Indo-China or Malaya, but all over the world—and, in particular, here in Australia? Some figures concerning America—which may be held as typical of the new "democratic" world generally—are calculated to make us think. In the U.S.A. alone, \$750 are spent on amusement, etc., for every dollar given to the works of religious bodies. In the same country, a murder is committed every forty minutes, and a million women are reckoned as sufferers from "social disease." There are also sixty suicides, daily, and a million annual illegitimate births. The copies of "sex magazines" printed monthly amount to 15 million.

We do not suggest that the people of the United States are exceptionally vicious—the figures given here are chosen because statistics are available and because the American world has become the center around which the hopes of man's freedom, and a civilization open to humane and Christian influences, are gathered in our own time. Others—no less striking—could be given to illustrate the moral decadence of our own country, or Great Britain.

What conclusion can we reach—except that so long as Christians are content to remain apathetic or inactive in face of this situation, our hopes of a decisive victory in the "war of ideas," and, above all, in the war of the spirit, cannot be reckoned as worth very much?—TRIBUNE, *Melbourne, Australia*, Dec. 25, 1952.

Gardens for Mary

JEREMY CLOUTHAM

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

A NAME is a funny thing, as Shakespeare recognized. Take the firm called Two Guys in Harrison. It's a New Jersey merchandising outfit that retails everything from tea-strainers to refrigerators right out of the freight car . . . *at wholesale prices*. It started up after World War II but thousands still battle to buy there. It has grossed millions for its owners. Who are these Two Guys in Harrison? Nobody knows. As long as they keep selling good products so low, nobody cares.

It's different with Two Guys in Philly. That's not their trade name, but the idea's the same. Only a few hundred people know who they are right now. But in no time thousands will be caring very much.

The gross is different, too. The Philadelphia pair charges such low prices they don't make any profit at all. That isn't just because the only thing they sell is flower seeds. As a matter of fact, the seeds are pretty unusual. They grow flowers with names that have been forgotten for more than 400 years.

The reason these Two Guys in

Philly don't make any profit is they don't want to. They're in it for love.

But love is funny, too. Real love brings blessings lovers don't expect.

John S. Stokes, Jr., a thirty-two-year-old industrial engineer in metals and a recent convert, walked as a lover through a garden at St. Joseph's Church in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, a couple of years ago when all this started. It was not as a human lover, though he is that too, happily married and father of three little children. It was as a lover of Mary.

The garden he walked through was unique in all the world. It was something that had not delighted the eye or swelled the heart of man since the England of that first Elizabeth. It was a Mary's garden.

Every flower in it, some imported by the devout Chicago lady who had planted it, Mrs. Frank R. Lillie, bore as its name some title of honor to Our Lady. They were the common names of flowers before the rage of the English Reformation swept all that away. Now a woman from mid-continental America was attempting to rebuild by transplantation the fra-

* New Haven 7, Conn., March, 1953

gile green bower that had once helped make England *Mary's Dowry*. Salt air stirred the bloomy heads that day in the garden at Woods Hole. It also set Stokes' pulses racing with a magnificent idea.

He disclosed it that autumn to a man under whom he was taking business courses at St. Joseph's Institute of Industrial Relations in Philadelphia, Edward A. G. McTague. The slight, pixyish McTague bit hard. A garden-lover himself, he joined his student in local research on pre-Elizabethan flower names for Mary. They came up with nearly 500. Of these, about 150 are commonly at hand.

That they are quite literally at hand is due to action by Stokes and McTague. For while their research was going forward, word came that equinoctial gales had half wiped out the Mary's Garden at Woods Hole. To fill the breach at once the two men founded Mary's Gardens. It is a blissfully unincorporated part-time apostolic project with headquarters at 901 South 47th Street, Philadelphia 43, Pennsylvania. From it, like the inexorable tendrils of faith, have gone swiftly forth in not quite two years a renewed spirit of prayer in the act of gardening and a unique form of devotion to Mary. The work has already found root in all the continents. It has well-nigh blanketed ours. The mailing list for this spring's catalogues is well over 5,000.

From a standing start of fewer

than 200 Mary's Gardens that spring of 1951, and several times that number the following year, this is quite a jump. Merchandising experts are stumped. Market analysts want to know the gimmick. Well they may, if they won't take love for an answer.

MAIL-ORDER BUSINESS

For without advertising, with very little fanfare, Stokes and McTague have sparked and set running what turns out to be a healthy little mail-order business. In fact it's now running away with them. It was supposed to be a leisure-hours affair, however devotional, since both men have families to support. But it threatens to become a full-time occupation. They've even had to use machines to help tuck the seeds into their envelopes and get them in the mail. The two "owners" are praying some alert religious society will move in and make it pay.

They themselves have never taken a penny out of it. What they charge for made-to-order Mary's Garden kits is figured out to cover costs, period. That means seeds, catalogue-cum-instructions, garden layout plans, seed packets and various informative leaflets, all of a wonderfully devout complexion. These kits cost \$1.00, \$1.50, \$2.00 and \$4.00. The lowest price tag will get you any five varieties of annuals, biennials or perennials from groupings in the catalogue. The higher price brackets bring respec-

tively ten, twelve and twenty-five varieties, selected to balance the three categories of growth in each case.

Some of the common flowers that pay Our Lady homage are, among the annuals, the collinsea (Blue-Eyed Mary), viper's bugloss (Our Lady's Flannel), Venus' looking-glass (Our Lady's Looking-Glass), morning glory (Our Lady's Mantle), balsam (Our Lady's Earrings), scabiosa (Our Lady's Pincushion), quaking grass (Our Lady's Tresses), periwinkle (Virgin Flower).

The biennials are fewer at the moment in the Stokes-McTague catalogue, but equally interesting. There are the pansy (Our Lady's Delight), the forget-me-not (Eyes of Mary), the hollyhock (St. Joseph's Staff), the foxglove (Our Lady's Glove) and mullein (Mary's Candle).

The perennials are the most numerous of all. Flowering as they do for several years in a row, they are also the most popular. Among them, for instance, is honeysuckle (Our Lady's Fingers). The simple cowslip is Our Lady's Keys. The Italian aster, which blooms in England on the feast of Our Lady's Nativity, September 8, is Our Lady's Birthday Flower. The wild violet, named for the modest manner in which the blossoms hang their heads, is called Our Lady's Modesty. The somber monk's hood becomes Mary's Slipper, and columbine is now again, after four hundred years, Our Lady's Shoes.

Our Lady's Tears is the ancient English name for the delicately scented lily-of-the-valley. Snow-drop has been restored to its ringing title, Purification Flower, Fuchsia, whose blossoms are so obviously pendant earrings, is once more Our Lady's Eardrops.

On a Montana farm, this spring, an Air Force officer will watch his children tend a Mary's Garden. He will carry word of it to air bases up and down the Pacific Coast, from Elmendorf Field in Alaska to the Mexican border. If, as may happen before this sees print, he is transferred to duty abroad, he will be one more messenger of the new-old good news to gardeners everywhere. The first bulletins outflow jets.

GLORIES OF GOD'S MOTHER

Novitiates of religious orders pricked up their ears as the early whispers of what was going on in Philadelphia moved forth on the spring breeze. Many were too late for planting that first year, but in 1952 they made up for it. Statues of Our Lady on seminary grounds all over the United States are ringed once more with blossoms that in their very blooming show forth to men her glories as God's Mother.

Nuns seem to have soared upward in joy at the thought, like a holy swarm of huge black-and-white birds. Their convent grounds, their classroom window-boxes, their retreat

houses, their cemeteries are all a-flutter with the colored wings, new-named, of Mary.

Naturally, this enthusiasm has carried over to children, whom nuns see so much of. In line with the hopes of Stokes and McTague, these ladies of God have encouraged little thumbs to begin their trek toward greenhood with a Mary's Garden at home. All that's really needed to start one is a window the sun comes through. Then, a sawed-off waxed milk container, or a cigar box with something to catch the moisture underneath it, or any discarded receptacle from a big cold-cream jar to a carefully scrubbed tuna fish can, will serve to start the seeds to seedlings. The instructions for soil care, moisture, sowing procedures, thinning of seedlings and ultimately the transplantation to outdoors or bigger window-ledge pots, are set down clearly in the Mary's Garden catalogue so that a child could understand them—which was the main idea.

BLOSSOMS EVERYWHERE

But the thing has gone far beyond children. A shop foreman in Detroit has a series of flats on the wide concrete window ledges of his part of the plant. Last year he started off modestly with a single window. This spring, what with the way his perennials flourished and the profusion of cuttings he took from some of the biennials, he has visions of a solid

Mary's Garden blanketing — up to flower height — one whole wall of the long production-line building he's in.

Such an ambitious project will undoubtedly take more than two spring-times of growing, but the industrial and human relations experts who've come strolling down from the front office to investigate are not going to say so to the foreman. They think he's got a great idea there. Several are amazed to find any plants will grow in a machine-shop atmosphere. Others take the fact that they do as a compliment to the company's care for its human workers. They feel the huge air-conditioning units at work in the building are part of the secret. But even though many of these officials are non-Catholic, they don't claim that's the whole story. One, a good Presbyterian and a home gardener of considerable skill himself, admits the foreman's project has moved him deeply. "I wouldn't want to be identified as saying so," he grinned, "but it would be funny if one of the strongest links in re forging a united Christianity were to be so fragile a thing as a flower's stem."

The engineer on a tug in New York harbor has a Mary's Garden going in his Brooklyn home and is planning another for the tug's mess. More than one police station swarming with Irish Catholic cops has found its borders graced with Mary's flowers, each identified with a modest little tag stuck on a stick in the midst

of the cluster. Up to now a flower seed packet has confined itself to the common name of the flower and its Latin or botanical name. Mary's Gardens goes one step further, not ignoring the two standard names but including — and of course featuring — the Mary's name too. The packets themselves are of a modest, pleasant gray color with dainty blue lettering for Mary.

WIDESPREAD APPEAL

Shut-ins, old folks, invalids, active people temporarily confined to hospitals and anyone on whose hands time, God's precious gift, hangs heavy are those to whom the two-fold appeal of this whole idea means most. Not only are they suddenly provided with something delightful to do, they have something that requires modest activity of the hands: something which very quickly brings rewards when the first slight green needle crumbles the soft earth above it, and then is followed in rapid succession by others. The thrill, the psychological impact of that experience is often next to the best medicine man can prescribe. It is what God prescribes that is truly best. And this also the Mary's Garden gives. For each blossom lifts a prayer to His Mother. Each act of crumbling the soil, firming it with blocks of wood, indeed of cutting an empty milk carton in two, is devotional in its essence. And devotion sustains.

Stokes and McTague have said this better:

Mindful of Tradition and the teaching, Mary's Gardens is an act of faith. Our Lady's Garden, as we mean it, is first of all the package which you receive from the postman. This Garden is an appeal to the heart. May it be that in your interior life this Garden blooms spiritually. And, too, may you be inspired to sow and tend so that of God's creatures, the seeds, there shall come foliage, buds and blooms in due season and according to His established order.

If the religious sense and dignity associated with gardening in the days of Christendom — as reported by old legends, chronicles and flower names — are to be restored and given substance in your work as well as in your heart it is essential that you give your stewardship careful preparation.

Seeds, plants, blossoms are of God's established order. With true understanding and devoted application of the principles of that order, the steward can tend his garden with confidence, peace and joy.

The good and faithful steward, therefore, first gains understanding of God's ordering of nature. Then he orders his own garden in the light of that understanding . . . ever directing his work not only to the garden itself, but first and last to the greater glory of God.

Then come the instructions in the Stokes-McTague catalogue for fulfilling this stewardship. Just to read them is to be tantalized, around this time of year, with dreams no commercial seed catalogue could conjure up. For the claims the Mary's Garden catalogue makes are modest and true.

The dignity of God's soil on the

human hand in this pursuit is pointed up in an interesting little footnote. The iris—the royal lily in its purple coat—is the emblem of Our Lady's ancestry through the House of David. Other flowers of great splendor and aroma, like the lily and carnation, have for centuries been associated with Mary. Roses in particular are her symbol in religious art and in prayer. Consider the traditional petition, "Mystical Rose, pray for us."

What's in a name? Evidently plenty, or Protestant England in its violent birth-pangs would not have tried so hard to divorce her name from flowers who is most like them. Stokes and McTague feel the same way, in reverse. Their singlehanded turning back of the clock has served to turn forward the eyes and hearts of men. It has revealed again a vista, too long shut by the blindness of revolt, blossom-bordered *à la* Mary into heaven.



Brave New World

For most Western thinkers of today the misty horizons of the future are filled with shapes of fear and menace, rather than bright hopes of a new order of peace and universal progress. Aldous Huxley, Orwell and others have written terrible phantasies whose theme is the dehumanization of mankind through the scientific techniques available to the rulers of tomorrow for the carrying out of their totalitarian power-designs. Applied science, in a world which has rejected the traditional notions of truth and value as objective absolutes, could mean—as C. S. Lewis warns us—the "Abolition of Man" as we know him in favor of "conditioned" beings moulded according to the shapes designed by the "Planners." More likely, the monsters of their devising will be rejected by nature and prove non-viable, while the remnant of mankind may well sink back into the anarchic barbarism of a new Dark Age. Finally, the sudden and dreadful increase in human powers of destruction, through atomic and hydrogen weapons, and the threatened horrors of artificially-strengthened bacteria, has brought in its train a very real fear that the future of the planetary being called man may be briefer than we dreamed, since he may perish by some crazy act of cosmic "*jelo-de-se*" committed in the course of his never-ending conflicts.—ADVOCATE, Melbourne, Australia, Jan. 1, 1953.

Migrant Farm Workers

JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.

Statement to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on the Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, February 11, 1952.

THE contribution I would like to make this morning is to comment from several points of view on the facts and problems of migratory labor as they have been revealed by the admirable work of the President's Commission and by the previous testimony before this Subcommittee.

I appear here, first of all, as an American citizen who is deeply concerned with whatever affects the well-being of our country, and as these hearings have clearly brought out, the problem of migratory labor does intimately affect the well-being not only of the individuals personally involved, but also of the country as a whole. My conscience as an American bothers me that a million or more of my fellow citizens should be denied the elemental decencies of life; that they should be exploited for profit; that they should be brushed off as rootless gypsies who prefer the pleasantries of travel to the confinement of a steady job.

I must admit that I was shocked last week when I witnessed from the Senate gallery the cynical performance of the majority of that august

body when they were asked to deal effectively with one of the most serious aspects of this problem. It is a matter of shame to this country — and I am sure, Senator, that you and all who are here this morning will understand that this criticism is not directed at any of the members of this Subcommittee; we know where you stand, and admire you for it — but it is a matter of shame to this country that organized pressure groups can reduce the elected representatives of the people to the position of pleaders for the narrow, selfish interests of the few. The operative principle seems to be: no vote, no interests; no pressure, no results.

I'm afraid that this may sound naive, but I assure you that it is a bitter pill for an American citizen to swallow. I know what are called the "realities" of political life, and I understand that all too often, when the issues are not too sharply defined, a man must choose between shades of gray. But I think that this issue comes closer than most to being one of black and white.

We hold it as one of our most

cherished American principles that all men are created equal. But for hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens this principle is cold comfort indeed. Their equality ends with the cradle, or before they even reach the cradle. From the time of their birth they will experience equality neither in nourishment nor education, neither in decent family life nor in reasonable economic opportunity. They will be social misfits and political outcasts. That is a matter to weigh heavily on the conscience of every American citizen, and more heavily on the consciences of those who could more directly do something about it. As a priest, I wonder how God will judge this nation, which tolerates such patent and widespread injustices.

DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

I also wonder how we can expect to "sell" our democratic ideals elsewhere when we won't "buy" them ourselves. We are spending millions, billions, abroad in an attempt to defend and rebuild democracy and to extend to others the opportunity to enjoy the essential rights and dignity of the human person. Could we not exercise our good intentions and expend a few of our dollars for the same purpose at home? Otherwise, may we not justly be charged with hypocrisy? May not others rightly tell us: "Physician, heal thyself"? Our enemies question and attack our

purposes and make effective use of every scrap of evidence that belies our sincerity. They manufacture it if they find themselves short. But by our scandalous negligence in setting right the injustices to millions of our own citizens, we provide ample grist for their propaganda mills.

It must be very evident that I feel strongly about this matter, and I cannot and do not want to deny it. The moral sense and conscience of any thinking person must be aroused at the sight of cruel and needless suffering. That this suffering is cruel has been amply testified to before the President's Commission and before this Subcommittee.

And I believe that the suffering is needless, because it can be alleviated and its causes can be eradicated. What is lacking is not the means but the will to do so. The charge has been made that the recommendations of the President's Commission are impractical, or idealistic, or impossible. Here we can say, as did C. K. Chesterton about Christianity, that the trouble is that it has not been tried and found wanting, but that it just hasn't been tried. The difficulty is, in both cases, that trying it means making an effort, and perhaps making sacrifices that hurt. But there are times when sacrifices are necessary, especially when the sacrifice called for is the renunciation by the few of the unfair advantages they enjoy at the expense of the many.

This is not a revolutionary doctrine that I am enunciating. It is not a denunciation of wealth or advantage as such. But it is a condemnation and a call for removal of manifest injustice.

It should be noted that it is not the migratory workers alone who suffer, though clearly they bear the brunt of the misery. The economy and the nation as a whole feel its effects in impaired health, in the unequal distribution of the burdens of defense, in lost productivity and in the many other social costs of poverty and wretchedness. Agriculture, already overburdened with the weight of economically underemployed resources—especially human resources—finds itself still more heavily burdened with the weight of a million or more part-time workers. And the family farmer finds the return for his own labor dragged down by the competition of the tragically depressed wages of the exploited migrant worker.

Our moral sense tells us that these conditions must not be allowed to continue, and our mind tells us that they need not. We do not need more studies, we need action. The President's Commission, the hearings of this Subcommittee and the work of previous commissions and committees have abundantly indicated what can be done. When can we expect effective action?

During the previous days of testi-

mony, I was waiting for the mention or discussion of what I considered one of the most fundamental aspects of this whole problem. To my recollection that aspect has not been brought out and so I would like to mention it here. It involves at the same time economic and moral issues.

IS MIGRATORY WORK NEEDED?

The question has been bothering me whether it can be established or not that migratory labor is *essential* to the operation of that segment of the farm economy which actually employs it. In other words, is the contribution of migratory workers so necessary to the two per cent of American farms which employ the bulk of them that the farm operations would collapse without them? And is the nature of this migrant employment such as effectively to eliminate the reasonable possibility of other gainful employment?

If the answer to these questions is in the affirmative, then on the basis of clear economic and moral principles that use of our human resources must justify itself by yielding to those engaged in it an adequate income and the possibility of a decent way of life.

If, in this supposition, it should be said that a full and adequate income cannot be paid, then something is wrong. Either the enterprise is being inefficiently managed, or someone is

taking too large a share, or, simply, the public is not paying enough for the products. Or it may be a combination of all three.

But still more fundamental is the question whether this kind of occupation can yield a decent way of life. Let us suppose that the income problem has been solved, and that of the over-all problem nothing is left but the uncomplicated fact that many hundreds of thousands of people live essentially on the move. Can such a way of life, particularly for families, be considered satisfactory? It would take more imagination that I have to see how families habitually on the move can provide the proper conditions for an acceptable way of life.

Thus we are faced with the question: do we want, or can we afford, those two per cent of the farms to be so organized that they require this kind of life? Or should we not rather make it a major objective of our farm policy and of our over-all social policy to bring about a change in that kind of farm organization and operation? That, I believe, is the fundamental issue involved in the migratory labor problem.

There is one more idea which I would like to present before finishing this testimony. Everyone acquainted with American agriculture knows that very great changes are now taking place. The technical and biological sciences, the arts and sciences of communication, the organizations and

institutions from the level of the local community all the way up to the Federal Government, all are contributing to the fundamental transformation of farming and of farm life.

REVOLUTIONARY PROGRESS

I am convinced that future historians, writing of this period, will note these changes, and will find them, if not of the same kind, at least of the same scope and intensity and importance to history as those changes which resulted in the Industrial Revolution. The changes now taking place in American agriculture are too many, too deep and too all-pervading to be considered as the ordinary, or even an accelerated, manifestation of progress. In their cumulative impact they are truly revolutionary.

We know the effects, good and bad, of the Industrial Revolution. We know that its force was allowed to run its course practically unhindered. The philosophy prevailing at the time of its ascendancy, "*laissez faire*," would allow of no interference with what was called, with perhaps unconscious irony, the beneficent hand of Providence. The unfortunate fact was that the beneficent hand reached only a comparatively few, and rewarded them richly. But for the many, for the masses of the industrial workers, there was only the crumbs from Dives' table. The Industrial

Revolution produced the proletariat—that nameless mass which Karl Marx urged to riot and revolution because, he told them, they had nothing to lose but their chains. We know what a long, uphill struggle it has been, accompanied by so much suffering and violence, to restore to the industrial worker his dignity, a decent living and the enjoyment of human rights.

Now we are witnessing a new revolution, the Agricultural Revolution, which is producing its own proletariat, migratory workers, and God help us if in a future time of crisis a new Karl Marx should arise to urge them to violent riot and revolution, for, truly, they have nothing to lose but their chains.

A revolutionary force, such as we are now experiencing, may with some justice be compared to a river at floodtime. You can't ignore it. You can't turn your back and pretend it doesn't exist, or if you do, you can only expect that it will gather its waters from a thousand sources, and in its turbulent swirl bring death and destruction to the unprotected lowlands. But if the threat be recognized in time, effective preventative action can be taken. Its waters can be checked at their sources and held for

later, controlled release. Then their very force and flood can be put to productive and peaceful uses.

So too with the flood of revolutionary changes now taking place in American agriculture. Unless wise and effective measures are taken now, we can only expect that along with some very real benefits we will also feel the force of destructive evils such as flowed from the Industrial Revolution. We have already allowed the flooding sweep of these changes in agriculture to snatch up and toss about like flotsam and jetsam a million or more of our fellow citizens. We have already allowed the Agricultural Revolution to produce its own proletariat.

The men and women who make up the migratory labor force, of whom we speak in the aggregate, are, each of them, human beings like us, and who can say but that, given a decent chance, human beings better than us. But as things stand now they never will have that chance.

It is no accident that the agricultural proletariat of China and other Oriental countries now forms the revolutionary base for the spread and strength of Communism. We still have the chance to avoid that disaster here.



It is fatal for the education of a child if education is religious at home and unreligious in the school. Our youthful generation must not become schizophrenic, a generation of split minds and split characters.—*Archbishop Muench.*

What's the Score at Michigan?

THE REV. FRANK J. McPHILLIPS
Rector, St. Mary's Student Chapel

*Reprinted from the CATHOLIC WOMAN**

MORE Catholic students attend the University of Michigan than the total enrollment at most Catholic schools. Nearly 2,000 Catholics were enrolled last year, and only the largest of our Catholic universities had a greater total student population.

The University considers the priest chaplains "religious counsellors" and they are designated as such in the faculty directory. But they have no direct connection with the University and not a single credit is given for any effort the student may make to improve his knowledge of his religion.

All religious activity is on a purely "voluntary" basis as far as the student is concerned, and yet last year Holy Communion was administered in the Chapel to more than 40,000. There were thirty-nine converts to the Faith, and private instructions given to many more who were planning marriage with Catholics. There was a very good attendance at each of the three daily masses; and the classes held in the Newman Club-rooms were, on the whole, well-at-

tended — all this being enough to lull one into a sense of security and to make one feel *almost* as though any danger that exists does not have much practical effect. I say *almost* because of the procession of troubled minds that unburden themselves in the chaplain's office, and the constantly repeated defections from the Faith that are learned about in devious ways.

We can count the number who receive Holy Communion and who embrace the Faith, but there is no way of knowing the number who lose their Faith or have it woefully weakened in this frankly secular environment. However, in trying to appraise the situation as it exists in the secular school of higher learning, it is essential to a proper judgment that one should not be swayed by unfounded prejudice.

Perhaps it is unfair to speak of education in secular schools as "Godless" or "without God," because then one is apt to conjure up the vision of professors leering over their desks at the students and trying to drive every

* 120 Parsona St., Detroit 1, Mich., September, 1952

thought of God and morality out of their young minds.

As a matter of fact, even in a University with a very large faculty, the number of those who make direct and repeated attacks upon the faith of the students constitute a decided minority. They are pretty well known and by their reputation they put up a warning that is usually so obvious that they give arguments only for those who do not want to believe.

One such professor had a young girl in his class who had no belief of any kind on the opening day of the semester, but was received into the Church on the closing day of the same semester. The evening she was baptized at the Chapel, she told about the "apology" that the professor had made to the class that morning for having destroyed their belief in the supernatural! Even here there is no need to look for malice, for it is very likely a case of ignorance blinded by pride — but the shame is that such a man should be able to abuse his position year after year without effective reprimand.

It seems to me that a greater danger lies in the professor who is well liked and who is an authority in his field, but who possesses no faith in the supernatural, and who allows his attitudes and remarks to be colored by his disbelief.

In principle, all secular education is "without God," but in actual practice, since all men have such pro-

nounced views concerning Him, He gets frequent mention in all sorts of classes where one would think that He need not be discussed, even by the most devout. For a system which professes to get along very well without God, and in which none of His revelations or moral laws may be taught as such, there seems to be a constant echo of the observation in Hamlet, "the lady doth protest too much!"

The fact that a school is "*secular*" should mean that it concerns itself exclusively with the education deemed necessary to get on in this world, and holds any consideration or preparation for the "other world" to be outside its field. The difficulty seems to be that every one is so deeply concerned about the matter of Eternity that he cannot let the subject alone, nor can he be neutral about it.

ABUSE OF POSITION

Even the secular schools where a department of religion has been established cannot prevent the teachers in other departments from presenting their lectures against the background of their own individual beliefs or disbeliefs — not to mention the deliberate abuse of their position by some who seem to delight in challenging, or attempting to destroy, the religious beliefs of their students.

Given an ideal situation, it might be said that the secular school is fine as far as it goes — but that it does

not go far enough. We have to go farther than to the grave; the system of education that does not recognize this fact is defective.

THE SECULAR MIND

As an instance of how the mind of the secularist works, a professor of philosophy once asked me, in all seriousness, if I thought it was the function of the University to produce *good* men and women. We had been discussing the possibility of teaching religion for credit in the secular school, and it was my contention that unless students are taught the reason for their existence and are told about the laws and plan of God for men, there is very little hope of producing *good* men and women — in the moral sense.

He would admit that nothing should be spared to graduate better lawyers and doctors and engineers and teachers in every sort of science — but to him their “goodness” in the moral sense seemed to be outside the scope of modern education.

He would agree, as so many do, that religion is a very good thing “for those who need it” (and he might even go so far as to admit that everyone would be better off for having some sort of religion) but to him it was simply something that belongs to the home and the churches and should be kept out of “education.”

Without even suggesting the denial of God's rights implied in such a po-

sition, one wonders if this sort of attitude might not be responsible for the number of highly educated men and women, products of our “modern education,” who have been willing to betray their country. It is no secret that the parade of American-born Communists who have been brought into the courts in one way or another in the last couple of years has contained a great many names written on advanced degrees from some of our finest institutions of secular learning. Certainly their secular education, in itself, could do nothing to make them realize their moral responsibility to God, and hence to their country because of Him.

I was glad to hear Father John Tracy Ellis tell the graduating class of Marygrove in 1951 that there has *never* been a Catholic traitor to our country. It would seem that there must be an ingredient in the formula for educating a Catholic that is lacking in secular education generally, and it doesn't take a very great search to find that Catholic schools, from primary grades through advanced graduate study, teach that every loyalty stems in some way from loyalty to God.

The modern test for everything seems to be the simple question — does it work? And even by this standard, in the matter of loyalty alone, it is the system “without God” that has produced the failures.

At a meeting of Newman Club

chaplains a few years ago, the question arose concerning the greatest danger that the Catholic student faces on a secular campus. It was evident that the main categories were professors, text-books and companions, but there was some disagreement as to which of these presented the greatest problem.

GREATEST DANGER TO FAITH

It is my personal conviction that the greatest source of danger to faith lies in the companions.

The text-book may be loaded with ideas contrary to faith and sometimes to morals, but I have never had a student quote a book as his explanation for the loss of faith or as a justification of his actions.

The living voice of the professor is of course a far greater danger. Students are often troubled and confused by his attitude and the apparent conviction with which he expounds doctrines completely opposed to their earlier training and beliefs.

Here, strangely enough, it is the more intelligent student who is in the greater danger — because he is able to follow the line of argument and if he does nothing in the way of reading or discussing the problem with the chaplain or someone else who can strengthen his position and answer the doubts presented, he has no antidote for the poison and may succumb. The student who is not so gifted mentally is more apt to hang

on to his beliefs with a determination that will help him to weather the storm.

But everyone is apt to have a difficult time with his companions. It takes a deep-seated and well-informed faith to withstand the continual war of attrition that goes on in the residence halls and other places where students gather for their interminable discussions. Again, there is no need to look for malice, but the Catholic student finds himself almost always in the minority when the discussion turns to religion.

The younger the student, the more likely he is to be a "hero-worshiper," and for the freshman to hear the junior or senior holding forth on his own particular theories about religion is often more than he can handle. Only by living in his environment is it possible to begin to understand the constant and unrelenting social pressure that is exerted *against* practising the Catholic religion even in a minimum degree.

Any "extras" in the way of daily Mass and special devotions often prompt not-so-good-natured scoffing and sometimes rather bitter denunciation. I suppose that never before in the history of mankind has an "education" been available to young people as it is today in our country, nor so necessary in order to attain success — but I wonder if the prize is worth the risk. It is to lessen this risk that we are on the campus.

Shortly after the middle of the last century, Cardinal Newman (who was then Father Henry Newman) conceived the idea of establishing a Catholic center at Oxford University. His idea was that there should be at that great University a place where the truths of the Catholic Church would be available for all who might be interested. Although he was not able to carry out his idea, his name has been given to the effort that is being made today to bring Catholic truth to the secular campus.

The Newman Club at the University of Michigan is but one of 600 such clubs in the country, making available the living waters of truth in the sandy deserts of modern materialism.

Our first purpose is to help the Catholic students maintain and develop a greater appreciation of their Faith. This is done by offering the Sacraments to them and by encouraging them to learn and know their Faith. Classes are offered at the Catholic students' center, and three priests are available for private instruction and discussions. The Chapel building, erected by Father Michael Burke, has served thousands of Catholic students since 1925, and we are now erecting an activities building (named after Father Gabriel Richard, who was a co-founder of the University) which will give increased seating capacity in the Chapel and

more attractive lounge, library and classrooms.

All this effort and planning and expenditure is being done, not in any way to replace Catholic colleges, but in recognition of the simple fact that more than ten per cent of the student body is Catholic, and the proper effort may not only prevent their loss to the Church, but actually make them leaders in Catholic thought and action.

In summing up "the score" at Michigan, there are two thoughts that come to mind with great clarity — first, the debt we owe to the present and preceding administrations of the University for their sympathetic understanding of our problems and their generous cooperation; and secondly, but even more important to the Church at Michigan, the attitude of the Bishops of Detroit who, since the establishment of the Chapel for the students in 1915, have been keenly aware of the needs of the students and have been willing to do everything in their power to provide for their spiritual welfare.

There has been, and unfortunately there will continue to be, great spiritual damage done to souls because of the materialistic atmosphere of this secular institution, but it would be impossible to measure the devastation that would have occurred over the years without this spiritual oasis, the Students' Chapel.

On Psychoanalysis

This article is reprinted from the OSSERVATORE ROMANO and is intended to be read in conjunction with the address of the Holy Father to which it refers, and which appears elsewhere in this issue.

IN his profound discourse made on the occasion of the audience granted to the members of the First International Congress on the Histopathology of the Nervous System on September 14, the Sovereign Pontiff, graciously acceding to the request submitted to him by the members of the Congress themselves, spoke on "The Moral Limits of Medical Research and Treatment." The Holy Father enumerates three principles which, from the moral point of view, can justify new procedures and new tests and methods of research and medical treatment, namely, the interests of science, the individual interests of the sick person and the interests of the community (the "common good"). And then he examines, point by point, whether these three principles are valid without restriction or only in a limited way, that is, within limits determined by the ethical order.

Discussing the utility and advantage of the individual, the Holy Father concerned himself, among other things, and in a reproving manner, with the "pansexual method of a certain school of psychoanalysis." This particular example is dealt with under the general question posed at

the beginning of this section of the discourse, namely, can the principle be admitted: "The medical treatment of the patient demands taking a certain step. This in itself proves its moral legality"? Or also: "A certain new method, hitherto neglected or little used, will give possible, probable, or sure results. By this fact alone, are all ethical considerations as to the licitness of this method obsolete and should they be treated as pointless?" Regarding this particular species of psychoanalysis His Holiness expresses Himself in these terms:

Here is another example. In order to rid himself of repression inhibitions or psychic complexes, man is not free to arouse in himself for therapeutic purposes each and every appetite of a sexual order which is being excited or has been excited in his being, appetites whose impure waves flood his unconscious or subconscious mind. He cannot make them the object of his thoughts and fully conscious desires with all the shocks and repercussions such a process entails. For a man and a Christian there is a law of integrity and personal purity, of self-respect, forbidding him to plunge so deeply into the world of sexual suggestions and tendencies. Here the "medical and psychotherapeutic interests of the patient" find a moral limit.

It is not proved — it is, in fact, incorrect — that the pansexual method of a certain school of psychoanalysis is an indispensable integrating part of all psychotherapy which is serious and worthy of the name. It is not proved that past neglect of this method has caused grave psychic damage, errors in doctrine and application in education, in psychotherapy and still less in pastoral practice. It is not proved that it is urgent to fill this gap and to initiate all those interested in psychic questions in its key ideas and even, if necessary, in the practical application of this technique of sexuality.

We speak this way because today these assertions are too often made with apodictic assurance. Where instincts are concerned, it would be better to pay more attention to indirect treatment and to the action of the conscious psyche on the whole of imaginative and affective activity. This technique avoids the deviations we have mentioned. It tends to enlighten, cure and guide; it also influences the dynamic of sexuality, on which people insist so much and which they say is to be found, or really exists, in the unconscious or sub-conscious.

These words of the Sovereign Pontiff offer an authoritative norm on the subject of psychoanalysis, which is so much discussed today. They also illustrate not a few of the inquiries made recently in the wake of a short article published some months ago in the *Bulletin of the Roman Clergy* (April, 1952, pp. 112-114). The Holy Father is not treating of psychoanalysis in general, nor of the various forms and techniques proposed and tried during recent decades by competent scientists, including

Catholics; but he is concerned with the "pansexual method of a certain school of psychoanalysis." Nor does he even treat of the nature and the therapeutic value of this method, but of the transgression of the ethical limit committed by it. Likewise the Sovereign Pontiff does not prohibit or condemn the psychotherapeutic treatment of sexual neuroses, but he does disapprove of the amoral method of acting in the practical application of the treatment.

OTHER METHODS

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that there are other psychoanalytical methods which are not infected with the vice of pansexualism; that furthermore, all the systems of psychoanalysis have in common certain principles, methods and psychic experiments which are in no way contrary to natural ethics and Christian morality, and, therefore, are not in any way touched or reproved by the Sovereign Pontiff. Even new and more profound researches and new experiments may be made in the field of psychoanalysis, provided that the ethical order is fully observed. But in all these cases it is possible to commit errors and abuses—and they are not infrequently committed.

On the other hand, it is to be deplored that recently in some countries and nations the habitual use of the exclusively sexual method for every nervous ailment has become prevalent

among not a few doctors (and even, unfortunately, some Catholics).

The latter constitute themselves as the defenders of this method on the theoretical level as well. They declare it to be licit, adducing the reason that its necessity is proven by a vast experience and by the results of this very experience. These psychoanalysts add moreover that priests, too, who are engaged in the care of souls or dedicated to the spiritual direction of consciences should know the substantial elements of the theory and practice of psychoanalysis, as thus understood, and should convince themselves that this means cannot be neglected, although they themselves personally must not use it but make use of the help of a competent medical psychoanalyst. Otherwise there is reason to fear—they maintain—that priests may exercise their spiritual ministry with danger and harm to souls.

Unfortunately, such ideas are imprudently proposed and defended in articles, books and conferences even

by some theologians who, more concerned with the medical aspect, neglect the established norms of Christian moral teaching, again promulgated and inculcated by the Sovereign Pontiff himself.

The newspaper is not the proper place for embarking upon an accurate and particular critical examination of the use of psychoanalytical methods. A Catholic doctor, always keeping in mind the authoritative norms given by the Holy Father, must make use of his own sound judgment and right conscience in governing himself in ordinary cases. In those cases where the ethical aspect is less evident, he will be able to consult authors who are competent in the subject of ethics, approved by the Church and recognized as safe in doctrine. On the other hand, the priest, too, who finds himself faced with difficult cases of serious neurosis can consult a competent and conscientious doctor or direct his client to a medical specialist who has his full confidence.



Glory of Ireland

Whatever can be said of Ireland, good or bad, this must be said: for centuries she has borne in her sacred flesh the mark of the five holy wounds. They were bloody during her long agony of crucifixion; they were shining on the day of her resurrection, and whatever the future may bring of blessings and trials, they will remain to the end the real source of her glory among the nations of the earth.
—Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S. J. in an address to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Los Angeles, Calif., March 17, 1953.

Editorials

Christian Democracy and European Unity

REGARDED as a group, the modern Catholic parties have wielded more power than any other group in Western Europe since 1945.

The credit is theirs for great achievements in reconstruction and in the restoration of disrupted social fabrics, for real progress in cooperation between their states, and for still more remarkable advances now under debate.

Foreign relations between the states of Western Europe have been, in particular, in the hands of the Catholic statesmen.

The alliances, amounting perhaps to union, which these states are trying to construct, have been preceded by a working partnership of Catholic Ministers in control of foreign affairs.

As an outward sign of the affinity, the three most important Foreign Ministers (M. Schuman, Signor De Gasperi, and Dr. Adenauer) all came originally from homes in the old middle kingdom in which Germanic and Latin cultures were commingled—Lorraine, the Trentino and the Rhine. All had studied at German-speaking Catholic universities in the other

world that existed before the first World War.

Under the guidance of these three men, so well qualified by tradition and background to understand each other's thoughts, the ambitious project of European union within the rough boundaries of the Empire of Charlemagne has been worked out.

If the project now faces controversy and the obstacles of national sentiment, it is still likely, whatever last-minute changes may be made, to leave a deep imprint on the course of European history. [Schuman recently ceased to be Foreign Minister of France. Bidault, another Catholic, took his place.]—*The Times, London, Jan. 24, 1953.*

The Pope and U. S. Catholics

EVEN the Pope can be neglected. His name appears, with that of Harry S. Truman and Fulton Sheen, well down in the list of the ten greatest men of the year as chosen by American school children. He issues important statements from time to time, and these make headlines in the daily press occasionally—especially when they can be twisted into some-

thing sensational, as happened in the affair Rosenberg. By and large, though, the Holy Father, like most fathers, is taken for granted.

Catholics, indeed, are proud of him, none more so than those in the United States. But there are so many things more immediate than the Pope: the next fight on television, the State basketball tournament, the Communist menace. Apart from the Protestant ministers who have taken the writings of Paul Blanshard seriously, and consequently have the papacy more or less chronically on their minds, Americans—and that includes Catholics—rarely think about the Pope.

This week seems to us the opportune time to remind our readers of what a great man we have occupying the chair of St. Peter. On March 2, his seventy-seventh birthday, Pope Pius XII observed the fifty-fourth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. On March 12 he celebrated the fourteenth anniversary of his coronation as Pope. It would become us as dutiful, if sometimes cantankerous, Catholic editors to come up with some well chosen words of praise for our reigning Pontiff.

What does it mean to be a Pope in this atomic age? What thoughts most frequently occupy the mind of His Holiness? What cause is dearest to his heart? What would he have us do to honor his anniversary? These were questions that popped into

our minds as we hastily reviewed the fourteen turbulent years Pius XII has served the servants of God. Doubtless the same questions will occur to our readers. No one but the Pope himself can answer them. And we think we found his answers while rereading his 1952 Christmas message.

Here they are in his own words:

During the arduous years of Our Pontificate, We ourselves have wished that what has poured in to Us from all parts of the world from the faithful who are well off should pour out in a constant stream to help Our poorer and abandoned children.

We have wished to be at the side of the refugees and to help them return to their homes. We have sought out orphans to assure them a roof, bread and another mother. We have been anxious to reach the imprisoned, the sick, the prisoners of war still kept far from their homeland.

Unfortunately, on every occasion to Our great sorrow, We have been faced with the realization that Our forces were and are unequal to the gravity and multitude of the needs. For this reason We would wish that a more intense and multiplied love for the poor should stir up, as it were, a flood of help, head-long in its holy impetuosity, which may penetrate wherever there is an old person abandoned, a poor person sick, a child who suffers, a mother desolate because she can do nothing to help it.

The best way to honor the Holy Father's anniversary is not with words but with actions. "These considerations encourage Us to call on your personal collaboration," the

Pope concluded his message. "The poor, those whom life has rudely reduced to straitened circumstances, the unfortunates of every kind, await it."

The Pope can rightly expect more collaboration from us Americans. We are frequently so smug in our Catholicism. We are justly proud of our school system, our magnificent parish plants, our gifts to the needy in all parts of the world, but we are complacent in our expertly staffed charity bureaus, as though they somehow released us from the command of charity. We brag of how well our faithful attend Mass on Sundays and keep the Friday abstinence, and look with ill-concealed scorn upon the Italian and other European Catholics who are not as we are. We bristle with something almost akin to contempt when some foreign Catholic dares to lecture us on our attitude toward the Negro or our lack of interest in social problems.

We American Catholics have not gone in person as we should to the poor and needy. We are not noted among our fellow citizens for the way we put ourselves out to discover the needs of the Negro, to interest ourselves in the housing conditions of the poor. Nor do we enjoy any particular reputation for the way we assist the drunks on skid row or join in community social projects.

Our Legions of Mary, our Societies of St. Vincent de Paul are too few.

We have not yet developed a parish life that is animated by Christ's commandment to love one another as He loved us.

More than any words of praise or our financial help, which has never been wanting, the Holy Father today needs the collaboration of American Catholics in his endeavor to do what is dearest to his heart: go in person to the poor and the unfortunates of every kind because they are Christ's brothers and our own.—INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD, Indianapolis, Ind., Mar. 6, 1953.

The Answer to Bigotry

THE NAME of Paul Blanshard has become synonymous with anti-Catholic bigotry. This unpleasant distinction Mr. Blanshard won by his widely circulated series of articles in *The Nation* and by his two books on the Church. Mr. Blanshard specializes in the distortion, the half-truth and the quotation taken out of context and given a new meaning. Using these weapons, he has spread disension and ill-will that will not die easily. It is unfortunately true that most people who read Blanshard's books or hear his charges second-hand will never get to see or hear competent Catholic rebuttals. As a result, Blanshard's attacks on the Church are undoubtedly doing a great deal of harm.

Americans are accustomed to dif-

ferences in religious conviction. No one thinks that Catholics should be exempt from criticism. No one claims that Catholics are above criticism, any more than Protestant citizens are, or Jewish citizens. Between such legitimate criticism, however, and Blanshard's thesis that a good Catholic cannot be a good citizen there is a world of difference.

Honest discussion is one thing; comparing Catholicism with Communism, as Mr. Blanshard does, is something entirely different. Reviewing Blanshard's newest book for the *Chicago Daily News* recently, Professor Jerome Kerwin of the University of Chicago wrote on this point:

No person is compelled to accept the Catholic Faith unless in conscience he can assent to it; it employs no jailers; it liquidates no person nor any class; it has no concentration camps, nor does it force confessions and stage mock trials. The difference on these points alone makes comparison between the two ludicrous . . .

Mr. Blanshard has allowed himself to be carried away by an intriguing thesis; for the sake of Christian charity and the common good it were better had he not produced it.

Catholics in this country have demonstrated their loyalty and patriotism often enough that they do not think they should be forced to stand and sing *The Star-Spangled Banner* every time a Blanshard comes along. Nor should it be necessary to prove our loyalty by dragging out the Army, Navy and Marine Corps casualty lists

every time some noisy bigot raises his head.

Religion and morality are the foundations of true patriotism, and the Catholic is a better, more responsible citizen of a democracy because of his religious beliefs. Any Catholic who is a bad citizen of this country is failing in his duty; he is a bad citizen in spite of, not because of, his Faith.

Since Catholics know all this to be true, attacks like those spearheaded by Paul Blanshard are naturally infuriating. We think it worth emphasizing editorially, however, that most people in this country who are anti-Catholic are that way because they don't know the Church. They know only the distortions and slanders of men like Blanshard. No one who really believed Blanshard's charges could be expected to have any respect for the Church. We must remember that people taken in by Blanshard are not hating the Church. They are hating a monster that does not exist.

Under the circumstances, the course open to Catholics is clear enough. The answer to Paul Blanshard does not lie in transferring anger at his misrepresentations to the people who have been misled by him. A chip-on-the-shoulder attitude by Catholics will not help. Nor will the opposite course, that of withdrawing into a private little world of our own, be any more successful.

The major way non-Catholics can get to know the Church as she really

is, and not as Blanshard portrays her, is through us. This fact imposes upon Catholics a heavy, sometimes frightening responsibility; in our own lives we have to give some inkling, however faint, of the beauty of the Church and of Catholic teaching.

Today, as for the last two thousand years, the Catholic is called upon to show Christ to the world. Today, as always, the Catholic is called upon to love his neighbor, black or white, brown or yellow, Catholic or atheist, Protestant or Jew. This love let loose upon the world is the dynamic force which can provide the real answer to Paul Blanshard. Our weapons are the age-old weapons of the Church: prayer, penance, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, burying the dead, counselling the doubtful, instructing the ignorant. These are a better answer to Paul Blanshard than a thousand editorials. — THE VOICE OF ST. JUDE, *Chicago, Ill.*, September, 1951.

Grace at Meals

THE saying of Grace before and after meals is, we strongly suspect, one of the casualties of modern living. Although it is impossible to estimate what happens in all our American homes in this respect, one safely surmises. How else can we account for people's negligence in such matters when eating publicly?

Recognizing such failures, the clergymen and merchants of a little

New York town, Mamaroneck by name, some 16,000 in size, this week initiated a plan designed to stimulate an awakening to the part God must play in our daily lives.

What they have done is something simple in itself, and yet a thing that cannot help but effect its purpose. They have printed, right on the very menus used in every eating establishment in the town, including lunch wagons, grills, taverns, restaurants and hotel dining rooms, appropriate prayers of grace which the reader is asked to recite silently while waiting to have his order taken.

These prayers were written by clergymen of each faith, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish. From reports, they have met with "enthusiastic unanimity." Every eating establishment in the town cooperated, and not one single customer has evidenced any disapproval. Most encouraging, to say the least. Which prompts us to suggest that, possibly, a similar venture should take form here in our own midst. We, too, need to be reminded of the propriety of asking God's blessing and giving Him thanks in return.

Quite truthfully, beyond the opening of a formal banquet, we must admit that we seldom, if ever, observe anyone saying grace publicly. We wonder why. Should we not acknowledge publicly our dependence on God? — CATHOLIC STANDARD AND TIMES, *Philadelphia, Pa.*, Mar. 6, 1952.

Documentation

Moral Limits of Medical Research and Treatment

POPE PIUS XII

Address by His Holiness on September 14, 1952 to the First International Congress on the Histopathology of the Nervous System.

THE First International Congress on the Histopathology of the Nervous System has succeeded in covering a truly vast amount of material. Through detailed explanation and demonstration, it had to put into exact perspective the causes and first beginnings of the diseases of the nervous system properly so-called and of the diseases we call psychic. A report was read and an exchange of views held on recent ideas and discoveries concerning lesions of the brain and other organs, which are the origin and cause of nervous diseases as well as of psychopathic illness. These discoveries have been made, partly, through entirely new means and methods. The number and nationality of the participants in the Congress, and especially of the speakers, show that specialists of the most diverse countries and nationalities have exchanged experiences not only for their own mutual benefit but to promote the interests of science, the interests of the individual patient and the interests of the community as well.

You do not expect Us to discuss the medical questions which concern you. Those are your domain. During the past few days you have taken a general view of the vast field of research and work which is yours. Now, in answer to the wish you yourselves have expressed, We want to draw your attention to the limits of this field — not the limits of medical possibilities, of theoretical and practical medical knowledge, but the limits of moral rights and duties. We wish to make Ourselves the interpreter of the moral conscience of the research worker, the specialist and the practitioner, and of the man and Christian who follows the same path.

In your reports and discussions you have caught sight of many new roads, but there remain a number of questions still unsolved. The bold spirit of research incites one to follow newly discovered roads, to extend them, to create new ones and to renew methods. A serious, competent doctor will often see with a sort of spontaneous intuition the moral legality of what he proposes to do and will act according to his conscience. But there are other instances where he does not have this security, where he may see or think he sees the contrary with certainty or where he doubts and wavers between Yes and No. In the most serious and profound matters, the

man in the physician is not content with examining from a medical point of view what he can attempt and succeed in. He also wants to see his way clearly in regard to moral possibilities and obligations.

We would like to set forth briefly the *essential principles* which permit an answer to be given to this question. *The application to specific cases* you will make yourselves in your role of doctor, because only the doctor understands the medical evidence thoroughly both in itself and in its effects, and because without exact knowledge of the medical facts it is impossible to determine what moral principle applies to the treatment under discussion. The doctor, therefore, looks at the medical aspect of the case, the moralist, the laws of morality. Ordinarily, when explained and completed mutually, the medical and moral evidence will make possible a reliable decision as to the moral legality of the case in all its concrete aspects.

In order to justify the morality of new procedures, new attempts and methods of research and medical treatment, three main principles must be kept in mind: 1) the interests of medical science; 2) the interests of the individual patient to be treated; 3) the interests of the community, the "bonum commune."

We ask whether these three interests, taken singly or even together, have absolute value in motivating and justifying medical treatment, or whether they are valid merely within certain determined limits? In the latter case, what are these limits? To this We shall try to give a brief answer.

I. The Interests of Science as Justification for Research and the Use of New Methods

Scientific knowledge has its own value in the domain of medical science no less than in other scientific domains, such as, for example, physics, chemistry, cosmology and psychology. It is a value which must certainly not be minimized, a value existing quite independently of the usefulness or use of the acquired knowledge. Moreover, knowledge as such and the full understanding of any truth raise no moral objection. By virtue of this principle, research and the acquisition of truth for arriving at new, wider and deeper knowledge and understanding of the same truth are in themselves in accord with the moral order.

But this does not mean that all methods, or any single method arrived at by scientific and technical research, offer every moral guarantee. Nor, moreover, does it mean that every method becomes licit because it increases and deepens our knowledge. Sometimes it happens that a method cannot be used without injuring the rights of others, or without violating some moral rule of absolute value. In such a case, although one rightly envisages and pursues the increase of knowledge, morally the method is not admissible. Why not? Because science is not the highest value, that to which all other orders of values — or in the same order of value, all particular values — should be subordinated.

Science itself, therefore, as well as its research and acquisitions, must be inserted in the order of values. Here there are well defined limits which even medical science cannot transgress without violating higher moral rules.

The confidential relations between doctor and patient, the personal right of the patient to the life of his body and soul in its psychic and moral integrity are just some of the many values superior to scientific interest. This point will become more obvious as we proceed.

Although one must recognize in the "interests of science" a true value that the moral law allows man to preserve, increase and widen, one cannot concede the following statement: "Granted, obviously, that the doctor's intervention is determined by scientific interest and that he observes the rules of his profession, there are no limits to the methods for increasing and deepening medical science." Even on this condition, one cannot simply concede this principle.

II. The Interests of the Patient as Justification of New Medical Methods of Research and Treatment

In this connection, the basic considerations may be set out in the following form: "The medical treatment of the patient demands taking a certain step. This in itself proves its moral legality." Or else: "A certain new method hitherto neglected or little used will give possible, probable or sure results. All ethical considerations as to the licitness of this method are obsolete and should be treated as pointless."

How can anyone fail to see that in these statements truth and falsehood are intermingled? In a very large number of cases the "interests of the patient" do provide the moral justification of the doctor's conduct. Here again, the question concerns the *absolute* value of this principle. Does it prove by itself; does it make it evident that what the doctor wants to do conforms to the moral law?

In the first place it must be assumed that, as a private person, the doctor can take no measure or try no course of action without the consent of the patient. The doctor has no other rights or power over the patient than those which the latter gives him, explicitly or implicitly and tacitly. On his side, the patient cannot confer rights he does not possess. In this discussion the decisive point is the moral licitness of the right a patient has to dispose of himself. Here is the moral limit to the doctor's action taken with the consent of the patient.

As for the patient, he is not absolute master of himself, of his body or of his soul. He cannot, therefore, freely dispose of himself as he pleases. Even the reason for which he acts is of itself neither sufficient nor determining. The patient is bound to the immanent teleology laid down by nature. He has the right of use, limited by natural finality, of the faculties and powers of his human nature. Because he is a user and not a proprietor, he does not have unlimited power to destroy or mutilate his body and its functions. Nevertheless, by virtue of the principle of totality, by virtue of his right to use the services of his organism as a whole, the patient can allow individual parts to be destroyed or mutilated when and to the extent necessary for the good of his being as a whole. He may do so to ensure his being's existence and to avoid or, naturally, to repair serious and lasting damage which cannot otherwise be avoided or repaired.

The patient, then, has no right to involve his physical or psychic integrity in medical experiments or research when they entail serious destruction, mutilation, wounds or perils.

Moreover, in exercising his right to dispose of himself, his faculties and his organs, the individual must observe the hierarchy of the orders of values—or within a single order of values, the hierarchy of particular rights—insofar as the rules of morality demand. Thus, for example, a man cannot perform on himself or allow doctors to perform acts of a physical or somatic nature which doubtless relieve heavy physical or psychic burdens or infirmities, but which bring about at the same time permanent abolition or considerable and durable diminution of his freedom, that is, of his human personality in its typical and characteristic function. Such an act degrades a man to the level of a being reacting only to acquired reflexes or to a living automaton. The moral law does not allow such a reversal of values. Here it sets up its limits to the “medical interests of the patient.”

CONDEMNS PANSEXUAL METHOD

Here is another example. In order to rid himself of repressions, inhibitions or psychic complexes, man is not free to arouse in himself for therapeutic purposes each and every appetite of a sexual order which is being excited or has been excited in his being, appetites whose impure waves flood his unconscious or subconscious mind. He cannot make them the object of his thoughts and fully conscious desire, with all the shocks and repercussions such a process entails. For a man and a Christian there is a law of integrity and personal purity, of self-respect, forbidding him to plunge so deeply into the world of sexual suggestions and tendencies. Here the “medical and psychotherapeutic interests of the patient” find a moral limit.

It is not proved—it is, in fact, incorrect—that the pansexual method of a certain school of psychoanalysis is an indispensable integrating part of all psychotherapy which is serious and worthy of the name. It is not proved that past neglect of this method has caused grave psychic damage, errors in doctrine and application in education, in psychotherapy and still less in pastoral practice. It is not proved that it is urgent to fill this gap and to initiate all those interested in psychic questions in its key ideas and even, if necessary, in the practical application of this technique of sexuality.

We speak this way because today these assertions are too often made with apodictic assurance. Where instincts are concerned it would be better to pay more attention to indirect treatment and to the action of the conscious psyche on the whole of imaginative and affective activity. This technique avoids the deviations we have mentioned. It tends to enlighten, cure and guide; it also influences the dynamic of sexuality, on which people insist so much and which they say is to be found, or really exists, in the unconscious or subconscious.

Up to now we have spoken directly of the patient, not of the doctor. We have explained at what point the personal right of the patient to dispose of himself, his mind, his body, his faculties, organs and functions, meets a moral limit. But at the same time we have answered the question: Where

does the doctor find a moral limit in research into, and use of, new methods and procedures in the "interests of the patient?" The limit is the same as that for the patient. It is that which is fixed by the judgment of sound reason, which is set by the demands of the natural moral law, which is deduced from the natural teleology inscribed in beings and from the scale of values expressed by the nature of things. The limit is the same for the doctor as for the patient because, as We have already said, the doctor as a private individual disposes only of the rights given him by the patient and because the patient can give only what he himself possesses.

What We say here must be extended to the *legal representatives* of the person incapable of caring for himself and his affairs: children below the age of reason, the feeble-minded and the insane. These legal representatives, authorized by private decision or by public authority, have no other rights over the body and life of those they represent than those people would have themselves if they were capable. And they have those rights to the same extent. They cannot, therefore, give the doctor permission to dispose of them outside those limits.

III. The Interests of the Community as Justification of New Medical Methods of Research and Treatment

For the moral justification of the doctor's right to try new approaches, new methods and procedures, We invoke a third interest, the interest of the community, of human society, the common good or "*bonum commune*," as the philosopher and social student would say.

There is no doubting the existence of such a common good. Nor can we question the fact that it calls for and justifies further research. The two interests of which We have already spoken, that of science and that of the patient, are closely allied to the general interest.

Nevertheless, for the third time we come back to the question: Is there any moral limit to the "medical interests of the community" in content or extension? Are there "full powers" over the living man in every serious medical case? Does it raise barriers that are still valid in the interests of science or the individual? Or, stated differently: Can public authority, on which rests responsibility for the common good, give the doctor the power to experiment on the individual in the interests of science and the community in order to discover and try out new methods and procedures when these experiments transgress the right of the individual to dispose of himself? In the interests of the community, can public authority really limit or even suppress the right of the individual over his body and life, his bodily and psychic integrity?

To forestall an objection, We assume that there is question of serious research, of honest efforts to promote the theory and practice of medicine, not of a maneuver serving as a scientific pretext to mask other ends and achieve them with impunity.

In regard to these questions many people have been of the opinion, and are still of the opinion today, that the answer must be in the affirmative. To

give weight to their contention they cite the fact that the individual is subordinated to the community, that the good of the individual must give way to the common good and be sacrificed to it. They add that the sacrifice of an individual for purposes of research and scientific investigation profits the individual in the long run.

The great postwar trials brought to light a terrifying number of documents testifying to the sacrifice of the individual in the "medical interests of the community." In the minutes of these trials one finds testimony and reports showing how, with the consent and, at times, even under the formal order of public authority, certain research centers systematically demanded to be furnished with persons from concentration camps for their medical experiments. One finds how they were delivered to such centers, so many men, so many women, so many for one experiment, so many for another. There are reports on the conduct and the results of such experiments, of the subjective and objective symptoms observed during the different phases of the experiments.

One cannot read these reports without feeling a profound compassion for the victims, many of whom went to their deaths, and without being frightened by such an aberration of the human mind and heart. But We can also add that those responsible for these atrocious deeds did no more than to reply in the affirmative to the question We have asked and to accept the practical consequences of their affirmation.

At this point, is the interest of the individual subordinated to the community's medical interests, or is there here a transgression, perhaps in good faith, against the most elementary demands of the natural law, a transgression that permits no medical research?

One would have to shut one's eyes to reality to believe that at the present time one could find no one in the medical world to hold and defend the ideas that gave rise to the facts We have cited. It is enough to follow for a short time the reports on medical efforts and experiments to convince oneself of the contrary. Involuntarily one asks oneself what has authorized, and what could ever authorize, any doctor's daring to try such an experiment. The experiment is described in all its stages and effects with calm objectivity. What is verified and what is not is noted. But there is not a word on its moral legality. Nevertheless, this question exists, and one cannot suppress it by passing it over in silence.

COMMUNITY EXISTS FOR MAN

In the above mentioned cases, insofar as the moral justification of the experiments rests on the mandate of public authority, and therefore on the subordination of the individual to the community, of the individual's welfare to the common welfare, it is based on an erroneous explanation of this principle. It must be noted that, in his personal being, man is not finally ordered to usefulness to society. On the contrary, the community exists for man.

The community is the great means intended by nature and God to regulate the exchange of mutual needs and to aid each man to develop his personality fully according to his individual and social abilities. Considered

as a whole, the community is not a physical unity subsisting in itself, and its individual members are not integral parts of it. Considered as a whole, the physical organism of living beings, of plants, animals or man, has a unity subsisting in itself. Each of the members, for example, the hand, the foot, the heart, the eye, is an integral part destined by all its being to be inserted into the whole organism. Outside the organism it has not, by its very nature, any sense, any finality. It is wholly absorbed by the totality of the organism to which it is attached.

In the moral community, and in every organism of a purely moral character, it is an entirely different story. Here the whole has no unity subsisting in itself, but a simple unity of finality and action. In the community, individuals are merely collaborators and instruments for the realization of the common end.

What results as far as the physical organism is concerned? The master and user of this organism, which possesses a subsisting unity, can dispose directly and immediately of integral parts, members and organs within the scope of their natural finality. He can also intervene, as often as and to the extent that the good of the whole demands, to paralyse, destroy, mutilate and separate the members. But, on the contrary, when the whole has only a unity of finality and action, its head — in the present case, the public authority — doubtlessly holds direct authority and the right to make demands upon the activities of the parts, but in no case can it dispose of its physical being. Indeed, every direct attempt upon its essence constitutes an abuse of the power of authority.

POWER OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY

Now medical experiments — the subject we are discussing here — immediately and directly affect the physical being, either of the whole or of the several organs, of the human organism. But, by virtue of the principle we have cited, public authority has no power in this sphere. It cannot, therefore, pass it on to research workers and doctors. It is from the state, however, that the doctor must receive authorization when he acts upon the organism of the individual in the "interests of the community." For then he does not act as a private individual, but as a mandatory of the public power. The latter cannot, however, pass on a right that it does not possess, save in the case already mentioned when it acts as a deputy, as the legal representative of a minor for as long as he cannot make his own decisions, of a person of feeble mind or of a lunatic.

Even when there is question of the execution of a condemned man, the state does not dispose of the individual's right to life. In this case it is reserved to the public power to deprive the condemned person of the *enjoyment* of life in expiation of his crime when, by his crime, he has already disposed himself of his *right* to live.

We cannot refrain from explaining once more the point treated in this third part in the light of the principle to which one customarily appeals in like cases: We mean the principle of totality. This principle asserts that the part exists for the whole and that, consequently, the good of the part

remains subordinated to the good of the whole, that the whole is a determining factor for the part and can dispose of it in its own interest. This principle flows from the essence of ideas and things and must, therefore, have an absolute value.

We respect the principle of totality in itself but, in order to be able to apply it correctly, one must always explain certain premises first. The basic premise is that of clarifying the *quaestio facti*, the question of fact. Are the objects to which the principle is applied in the relation of a whole to its parts? A second premise is the clarification of the nature, extension and limitation of this relationship. Is it on the level of essence or merely on that of action, or on both? Does it apply to the part under a certain aspect or in all its relations? And, in the field where it applies, does it absorb the part completely or still leave it a limited finality, a limited independence?

The answers to these questions can never be inferred from the principle of totality itself. That would be a vicious circle. They must be drawn from other facts and other knowledge. The principle of totality itself affirms only this: where the relationship of a whole to its part holds good, and in the exact measure it holds good, the part is subordinated to the whole and the whole, in its own interest, can dispose of the part. Too often, unfortunately, in invoking the principle of totality, people leave these considerations aside, not only in the field of theoretical study and the field of application of law, sociology, physics, biology and medicine, but also of logic, psychology and metaphysics.

* * *

Our plan was to draw your attention to certain principles of deontology which define the limits and confines of research and experimentation in regard to new medical methods to be immediately applied to living men.

In the domain of your science it is an obvious law that the application of new methods to living men must be preceded by research on cadavers or the model of study and experimentation on animals. Sometimes, however, this procedure is found to be impossible, insufficient or not feasible from a practical point of view. In this case, medical research will try to work on its immediate object, the living man, in the interests of science, in the interests of the patient and in the interests of the community. Such a procedure is not to be rejected without further consideration. But you must stop at the limits laid down by the moral principles We have explained.

Without doubt, before giving moral authorization to the use of new methods, one cannot ask that all danger or all risk be excluded. That would exceed human possibilities, paralyse all serious scientific research and very frequently be to the detriment of the patient. In these cases the weighing of the danger must be left to the judgment of the tried and competent doctor. Nevertheless, as Our explanation has shown, there is a degree of danger that morality cannot allow. In doubtful cases, when means already known have failed, it may happen that a new method still insufficiently tried offers, together with very dangerous elements, appreciable chances of success. If the patient gives his consent, the use of the pro-

cedure in question is licit. But this way of acting cannot be upheld as a line of conduct in normal cases.

People will perhaps object that the ideas set forth here present a serious obstacle to scientific research and work. Nevertheless, the limits we have outlined are not by definition an obstacle to progress. The field of medicine cannot be different in this respect from other fields of man's research, investigations and work. The great moral demands force the impetuous flow of human thought and will to flow, like water from the mountains, into certain channels. They contain the flow to increase its efficiency and usefulness. They dam it so that it does not overflow and cause ravages that can never be compensated for by the special good it seeks. In appearance, moral demands are a brake. In fact, they contribute to the best and most beautiful of what man has produced for science, the individual and the community.

May Almighty God in His benevolent Providence give you His blessing and grace to this end.



Danger of Hypnotism

No person can be hypnotized against his will. There must be willing subjection. Nobody can hypnotize when and how he pleases. It is impossible without the subject's consent. Is it likely that God who gave us free will would allow it to be filched from us against our wish? God's providence is abiding. This is evidenced by the fact that infants, lunatics and idiots are immune from hypnotic suggestion.

The will cannot be imposed upon by mere intensive brainwork or the abracadabra of another. Were that possible to do, where should we be if, say, a government wished to impose its will upon its subjects without fear of criticism or revolt? Even the mighty Kremlin cannot do that! Only a person in full possession of his reason can surrender his liberty and hand over his reason to the domination of another. By acting in such manner he abdicates the rights of conscience and renounces the integrity of his personality.—*E. J. Keegan in the CATHOLIC MIRROR, Springfield, Mass., January, 1953.*



The Red Cross

The blood program of the Red Cross alone should be enough to bring forth generous contributions during the annual campaign from the citizens of this country. But the Red Cross does more. It is first in the field to aid the victims of disaster. It trains countless thousands in skills to protect their families and neighbors in times of emergency. It is at the service of bed-ridden war veterans. In fact, it is an almost omnipresent factor wherever extraordinary help for afflicted people is needed. Our response to its annual call should be in proportion to the vast work of mercy in which it is engaged.—*CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT, Hartford, Conn., Mar. 5, 1953.*

Letter to Marshal Tito

THE YUGOSLAV HIERARCHY

MR. MARSHAL: We, the undersigned Bishops and the Apostolic Administrators of the Catholic Church in the territory of the Federal National Republic of Yugoslavia, have examined during our joint conference in Zagreb, held from September 23 to September 26, 1952, among other pastoral questions, also the conditions under which the Catholic Church exists in Yugoslavia, and consider it our duty to address to you, as the Supreme Chief of State, the following memorandum concerning some of the more important problems of the religious life of our faithful.

The Catholic Bishops of the F.N.R.Y. first of all state that in Yugoslavia there is no complete religious freedom. The freedom of conscience and religion to which the Constitution of the F. N. R. Y. (Art 25) refers is in practice reduced to partial freedom of worship (*cultus*) or, as our law says, the freedom of religious rites. We say *partial*, because the freedom of worship is in some respects limited to such an extent as *de facto* to mean the negation of genuine religious freedom.

The churches are, it is true, still open, although some of them, sometimes with high artistic value, as for example the Church of the Trappist Fathers at Delibasino Selo, near Banjaluka, have for a certain period been used as store-houses for wheat or agricultural machinery. The monumental Church of St. Joseph at Ljubljana has been transformed into a film studio, while the ancient Church of the Crusad-

ers, also at Ljubljana, a real gem of ecclesiastical art, was taken from the Catholics and simply, without consultation, given to the Old-Catholic sect — which, incidentally, at Ljubljana, lacks almost any adherents.

Very many roadside crosses and paintings have been destroyed, but the perpetrators of these violations can never be discovered. The same thing has happened to some of the smaller chapels in Slovenia and in other parts of the country.

The large and beautiful Church of the Holy Redeemer at Rijeka was mined overnight and destroyed at the beginning of November, 1949, although it stood in the very center of the town. The Church of the Carmelite Sisters at Selo at Ljubljana was destroyed, and without any reason the beautiful chapel Salita al Calvario, on the island of Krk, was demolished. As far as we know, in the same way many Catholic churches in Banat have been destroyed, while, in different parts of the country, many public oratories, in the former institutions of the nuns, have been closed down by force.

The Church of Our Lady at Ptujška Gora, the biggest place of pilgrimage in Maribor Diocese, was, without consent, and against the will of the ecclesiastical authorities, transformed into a museum.

The State authorities give no permission at all for the building of new churches (Osijek, Bitoljic, near Sinj, Novo Selo, near Djakovica, etc.), and

it is difficult to obtain permission for the repairing of old ones.

SYSTEMATIC PERSECUTION

The record-books of the born, dead and married were taken away from the Church authorities even in 1946. Nevertheless, the State authorities arrogate to themselves the right to make evidence at their will also in the new record-books, which the Church has been making since May 9, 1946, solely for her internal use. The old record-books have not as yet been given back to the Church, though the time for it (the end of 1951) has already passed.

The UDBA authorities require *organists, both men and women*, and masters of ecclesiastical chant, to leave their duties.

Processions are, in the most parts of the country, forbidden, and the bigger religious celebrations, where the faithful from several parishes assemble, are frequently obstructed in various ways. In particular the celebration of so-called *first Masses* is obstructed. The hostility of the authorities goes so far as to take away from the young priest also the gifts *in natura* which were given by the faithful on this occasion, according to the ancient custom.

The freedom of preaching is also endangered. Priests are sometimes cited for responsibility because in quotations of Holy Scripture or in positive explanations of religious truths are seen actions against the State and the existing social order. The State has even gone so far as to forbid priests to oppose atheistic propaganda amongst children. "Priests," so it is written in an instruction of the internal section of Sreski Narodni Odbor in Bosnia and Herzegovina, "are not allowed to influence the parents, lest their children should not become atheists." From another

priest it was required that in his sermons he should persuade the faithful not to go to church.

Priests are not allowed to give religious instruction in schools, presbyteries and other ecclesiastical premises: there are many cases where priests were prohibited from giving instruction to the youth in the churches themselves, even such as the preparation for first Holy Communion or Confirmation. The priests, because of the breach of such prohibitions, are cited and punished by fine or arrest.

The Church and her institutions are overcharged by *disproportionately high taxes*, and when the priests are not able to pay them, they are distrained and deprived of their belongings, or the goods of the presbyteries are seized (Trsat, Volar, Desinic, Draganic, Novalja). There are even cases where from a Diocesan Curia and from some Sanctuaries of Our Lady (Brezeje, Ptuj-ska Gora) all money for Mass stipends, which was temporarily deposited in their treasuries, was distrained.

Many churches are not allowed in any way to collect ecclesiastical alms. The Cathedral at Ljubljana had to pay 10,000 dinars fine, because its sacristan removed ten dinars from the altar: an offering which had been left there by one of the faithful.

In Slovenia, and in other parts, it is made impossible for ecclesiastical institutions even to receive gifts from abroad. At the beginning of May this year there arrived at Rijeka some large parcels of used clothing and a certain quantity of powdered milk and eggs, a gift from American Catholics to the priests, religious and seminarians of the dioceses Rijeka, Senj, Krk, and Zadar. This gift had to be returned to America, because the authorities required in taxes and customs duties more than six million dinars — more than these poor

dioceses could afford. In July this year there arrived at Rijeka from the same American Catholics gift parcels of flour and oil for the dioceses of Senj, Krk, Rijeka and the seminary of Rijeka. These parcels had to be returned to America, because the duties on them were so high that the flour, which had been sent as a gift, would be much dearer than the flour from the home market.

THE ARRESTS OF PRIESTS

The arrest of the priests goes on, and the punishments received by them exceed in severity the already rigorous standards which are generally applied to our legal practice. For example, Karlo Gnidovec, the seventy-five-year-old and much respected parish priest and dean of Zuzemberk, was, a few days ago, sentenced to death by shooting for acts supposedly committed during the war.

There are still in Yugoslav State prisons more than 200 priests, and one can say with a clear conscience that during the last eight years a *considerable* part of the Catholic clergy have experienced, for longer or shorter periods, the disgrace and hardships of the prisons. Among the imprisoned clergy there is also the Bishop of Mostar, Dr. Peter Cule; while the Archbishop, Dr. Aloysius Stepinac, does not yet enjoy full freedom. It is indeed astonishing how the clergy, which in all the civilized countries of the world has the least to do with penal codes, in our own country has become incorrigibly criminal!

Physical attacks on the priests are not rare. During the last seven years about eighty priests have been killed by ambush, secretly, and in the majority of these cases the perpetrators have not been discovered and punished. This ferocity reached its climax in the attack on the person of Mgr. Anton Vovk,

Bishop at Ljubljana, while he was officially travelling. On January 20, 1952, he was physically attacked at the railway station at Novo Mesto: petrol was poured on him and ignited. But for his presence of mind he would have been burnt alive. Here is the strangest thing: the attacker was only condemned to nine days' conditional jail for his crime!

This same Bishop is not granted permission to visit places in the border zone, even in cases where he is obliged to make canonical visitation and administer Confirmation. His canonical visitation to Jesenice was regarded as a provocation, and a terrorist group, on his arrival at Jesenice itself, forced him to return to Ljubljana, while thousands of people inside and outside the church were expecting their Bishop.

Nor is permission granted to the Bishop of Maribor, Dr. Maximilian Drzecnik, to visit his parishes in the border zone. We also possess certain information about the obstacles placed in the way of the other Bishops performing canonical visitations in the territory of their dioceses.

REPRESENTATIONS IGNORED

The State authorities, wherever they can, ignore the Church and her institutions. The Catholic Hierarchy, in its references, from 1945 up till the present, has addressed to the Government of the F. N. R. Y. at least six documentary memoranda, and has never received any answer, except that the Religious Commission at the presidency of the Government of the F. N. R. Y. on May 19, 1950, laconically informed the President of the Episcopal Conferences, the Archbishop of Belgrade, that the memoranda of the Hierarchy from April 26, 1950, "are compiled in such an impossible spirit that they cannot be taken as a basis for negotiations to

regulate the relations between the Government of the F.N.R.Y. and the acting President of Episcopal Conferences, and the other signatories of the mentioned memoranda." And that was all.

And how many memoranda, applications and complaints the individual Ordinaries have addressed to different departments of the Federal Government, to the Republic Governments and to other authorities of the State administration, without receiving any answer! The ecclesiastical offices are not organs with which the State authorities would condescend to correspond. The Church must be humiliated at any price!

OFFICIAL ATHEISM

There is, finally, the very painful question of the *official atheistic course in the schools and in the whole public life of the F.N.R.Y.* Atheism is the religion of the regime. Atheism is taught in the schools, preached in the conferences, propagated in the press, enforced on the employes and on the Army. Teachers in the elementary and middle (grammar and similar) schools are formally forbidden to frequent the churches. Teachers who do not obey this command are dismissed from their posts. In a State employe religiousness is considered as the worst possible characteristic. Officers of the Yugoslav Army dare not even think of getting their children baptized.

The school children, too, are summoned, if they go on Sunday to church or express their religious feelings in any other way. There are cases where students are excluded from teachers' training colleges for the sole reason that they have declared themselves to believe in or to be fulfilling their religious duties. Although physical punishment is strictly prohibited in the schools, yet it happens that teachers in villages severely beat school children

because the children dared to attend Mass or to take part in religious instruction in the church.

Recently, on the feast of the Nativity of Our Lady (September 8), a scene developed in a village church for which a trustworthy witness guarantees. He stood at the back of the church, and suddenly noticed how the children present in the church hid like frightened birds under the skirts of their parents, or ran amongst the groups of women, who were in great number in the church, so that the children could remain amongst them unnoticed. A father covered his son with a cloak so that it seemed as if the child would be suffocated. A man who observed this, astonished, asked the father: "What are you doing? Do you not see that your son will be suffocated?" And the peasant answered: "The teachers have come into the church. If they see my little one, they will beat him!" And, indeed, three local teachers came into the church, apparently not to pray to God, but to find out which school children were in church, so that they would be able to punish them later.

To these proofs of lack of religious freedom in the F.N.R.Y. must be added the old ones, already stated in the memoranda of the Hierarchy from former years.

Among them is to be mentioned the *liquidation of the whole of the Catholic schools in the territory of the F.N.R.Y.* The whole series of classical and real gymnasia, teachers' training colleges, civil schools, technical and elementary schools and kindergartens have been abolished with the stroke of a pen, and their buildings confiscated from their legal owners.

The Church's right is only recognized in the so-called religious schools — i.e., the schools for the education of the clergy. But these schools are ex-

posed to so many vexations and limitations that it is clear that their existence is only tolerated as a necessity and temporarily. To mention but one thing: these schools are deprived of public recognition, although their teaching staff is qualified, and their students are denied all the privileges which the students of the public schools enjoy (reduction on railway tickets, a shorter term of Army service, etc.).

All printing presses belonging to the Catholic Church and her institutions in the country *have been seized*, without compensation having been made. Twenty big printing enterprises and literary publishing societies passed overnight into the hands of the State: this is a loss which cannot be overestimated.

Thus, one can say, *the Catholic Press is completely destroyed*. A couple of small insignificant religious periodicals, which are still published, are so limited in volume and circulation that the religious press in the F.N.R.Y. can no longer be said to exist. And even these miserable remnants of the once powerful Catholic Press, which possessed before the war 152 Catholic publications, can hardly exist. High taxes and frequent confiscations because of, as it is alleged, the tendentious publication of articles—and yet these are often simply reprints of articles published in the State Press, or quotations from the speeches of the State leaders—all these things obstruct the correct functioning of the Catholic Press. Finally, there is hardly any use to us from these insignificant periodicals, which must be kept silent, while the monopolized State Press daily attacks the Catholic Church, her Bishops and priests, sneers at the Faith, falsifies historical facts, thus damaging the Church, and makes a mockery of ecclesiastical persons, religious rites, etc. But what causes us

the deepest grief, Mr. Marshal, are *the coarse and bitter attacks on the person of the Holy Father, the Pope*, whom we honor as the Supreme Pastor of the Church and the Vicar of Christ on earth.

We mention further *the suppression of convents* and the liquidation of Congregations of Sisters in whole provinces (Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina), the prohibition of almost all religious societies, and the lack of any organized form of Catholic public life. We mention finally, although unwillingly—because we ascribe to this problem only secondary importance—that, in the nationalization of the ecclesiastical possessions, in some cases not even the laws issued by the actual authorities have been observed.

All this undoubtedly proves that in the F.N.R.Y., freedom of conscience and religion does not exist, and that the Catholic Church is refused the most elementary liberties and her vital rights are endangered. In this short review we could not, of course, enter into all the details possible. We are, however, ready at any moment to provide exhaustive documentation for all the statements made above, on the sole condition that we are granted liberty to collect and publish the evidence.

IS AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND STATE POSSIBLE?

After all we have stated, it is not difficult to answer this question. If it is required from the Church that she, for the sake of the agreement, or, as our authorities say, for the sake of friendly collaboration with the State authorities, is to give up her essential, vital rights, then such an agreement is impossible. The Church has never in her history agreed to unconditional surrender, and she will not do this now. To require from the Church that she recognizes

the actual situation in the F.N.R.Y. as lawful and definitive would mean the same as to ask her to deny herself or to sign her death sentence.

The Church in the F.N.R.Y. is always ready for negotiations and for reasonable concessions, but on condition that her moral and juridical status is completely recognized, and that all her rights, which she has as regards her nature and end, are guaranteed. That means that if the State honestly wants correct relations with the Church, before anything else all the injustices crying out to heaven are to be removed, injustices to which ecclesiastical institutions and persons are exposed daily, and the course of persecution, which has been in force from the beginning of the F.N.R.Y. up to today, must be stopped.

If this is not done the Hierarchy will be confirmed in the conviction that the F.N.R.Y. aims at the complete destruction of religion. This destruction has to be performed in stages. Some such stages are already behind us, and at present, according to our opinion, we are at the last but one. The aggressive atheism has already reached the church doors, and now, as we have seen, it makes preparations to penetrate into the last asylum of religious freedom.

The State authorities in the F.N.R.Y. enforce, as particularly suitable means to regulate the relations between Church and State, the establishment of priests' professional associations. Such associations exist already, mostly without the permission of the competent Bishops, in the whole territory of the N.R. Slovenia, in Istria, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are convinced that such associations have not the required conditions to achieve such a great task: first of all, because their setting up is always urged by the State authorities, which for this purpose go around visit-

ing the priests; then, among other things, the way of their activity and the suggestions which the members of the association receive from the State authorities entitle us to the conclusions that the priests' associations, according to the intentions of their patrons, must serve the purpose of breaking ecclesiastical discipline and the progressive weakening of religious life, and not to regulate the relations between Church and State.

If it is required from the Hierarchy to permit such associations, then it is necessary to bring their rules into harmony with canonical prescriptions, and to secure for the ecclesiastical authority a full control of their activities. Only on these conditions is the Hierarchy willing to take into consideration the possibility of the recognition of such professional priests' associations.

OUR LAST WORD

The Catholic Hierarchy has always maintained a position of loyalty towards the existing State authority; and the Hierarchy holds it today. We do not wish to develop revolutionary activity. On the contrary, we sincerely love our fatherland, and we will ask the priests and faithful to assume a friendly attitude towards everything that is positive in the actual social-political system. It is obvious that we, together with our faithful, uphold the integrity of our State borders, and that we are prepared for every sacrifice for the benefit and prosperity of our State community. One thing cannot be yet expected from us: active participation in the political life of the country. Politics and the responsibility for it we leave to those who have a vocation for it. We will care for the moral and spiritual foundations of our social and political life. This is our domain, and our part in this field cannot be compensated with anything.

In return we do not claim any privileges. We shall be satisfied if what belongs to us according to divine and human right is recognized and given to us. We understand by this term not only freedom of worship but the whole complex of liberties which are included in the idea of freedom of religion and conscience. They are: freedom of confessional schools, freedom of the Catholic Press, and freedom of religious organizations and, together with this, the right to dispose freely of the material means which we need. We do not expect to receive these means as a present from the State: the people, who believe in their Church and love her, will provide them for us.

If the present State authority accepts these principles, we Catholic Bishops consider that the tension between the Catholic Church and State of the F.N.R.Y. will soon decrease, and even that these relations will be settled for mutual benefit. And this is an aim which is worth some sacrifice.

This memorandum, Mr. Marshal, we Catholic Bishops of the F.N.R.Y., from our Plenary Conference in Zagreb, address to you as the supreme head and chief of our State community, having the hope in full confidence that our memorandum will receive that reception and understanding which is appropriate and becoming to its obvious importance.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.